

The World as Power Reality

BY
SIR JOHN WOODROFFE

GANESH & CO., MADRAS

937
10/10/10

FOREWORD.

The present book is the first of a series which I hope to be able to complete, explaining succinctly some general philosophical principles of the Doctrine of Shakti or Power from the Shâkta Vedânta standpoint. A correspondent once asked me—what was that? The answer is, that it is that Doctrine which is to be found, expressly or implicitly, in the Tantras of the Âgama Shâstra of the Advaita Shâkta and Shaiva communities of worshippers. The two have points in common in (amongst others) their Doctrine of Shakti and its evolution as the 36 Tattvas and so forth. Thus the latter are explained in both the Gandharva Tantra, the Kashmirian Tattva Sandoha, and other works. In the Prâtaḥ-Kritya as set out in the Mahânirvâṇa Tantra (V. 39) Salutation is made to Âtma-tattva, Vidyâ-tattva, and Shiva-tattva, these being the threefold divisions of the 36 Tattvas.

In what way another enquirer asks—is it to be distinguished from Vishishtâdvaita? The answer is that according to the latter the Universe is the Body of the Lord both now and in dissolution, that is always, whereas according to Shâkta views though we may speak of the existing Universe as the Body of the Mother-Power (in Herself or *Svarûpa*, infinite and pure Consciousness or *Chidrûpinî*) yet in dissolution the Universe, the Power whence it proceeds and of which it is a transformation, and the Changeless Real or Shiva are one.

The books will be short but with much condensed substance. My object is to state general principles with reference to the thought of the day. The present counts. It is because Indian Philosophy and Religion are too often treated in an archæological way, as things which have been and are gone, and as wholly unrelated to, and without value for, current thought, that they do not often receive the attention and respect which is their due. My own conviction is that an examination of Indian Vedantic Doctrine shows that it is, in important respects, in conformity with the most advanced scientific and philosophic thought of the West, and that where this is not so it is Science which

will go to Vedânta and not the reverse. This is not necessarily proof that it is true, for the teaching of Western Science may or may not be well founded, and has certainly undergone revolutionary changes from time to time. What is laughed at to-day is accepted to-morrow and *vice versa*. But if Western Science is deemed of value, so must be the Vedantic teaching which is in conformity with it.

This series will illustrate more fully what is here stated, but in a general way some examples may be given in support of it. The primary doctrine of Advaita Vedânta is Unity. The world is not a heap of entirely disparate things thrown together by chance. All are connected, the one with the other and suffer and enjoy through one another. Some gain this truth through their reason, others through their heart and others again by the stick. Thus the late war has discovered the truth to those ignorant of it—that each people and each man are dependent the one on the other. So that if we harm others we harm ourselves immediately or in the long run. Practical Science is charged with the same mission. Railways, steamers, aeroplanes, the telegraph, the telephone, all help to establish the idea of the unity of man-

kind, to diminish particularism and to foster a wide view of the Universe and its meaning.

India has ever held views which are both wide and of the deepest. Her infinities may bore or appal some. But who will deny that Her ideas have been the most colossal the world has known? Her fearless logic has stayed at nothing, until reaching the last barriers of thought, man transformed by *Sâdhanâ* and *Yoga*, has attained That which is alogical. By thinking and direct experience unity is known. Western Science is working towards the same or similar conclusions by its own objective experimental method. In this process it is destroying the difficulties and contradictions, which itself had created. It has set up partitions which it now pulls down. Some of them may be pragmatically useful, for thinking would be fluid unless we controlled the continuous flow of phenomena by divisions, labels and so forth. Some are indeed imposed on us from without, for this power to impose itself on the mind is a test of our Reality. But others are the product of imperfect observation and gratuitously erroneous thinking. None according to Vedânta are essentially justified.

Unity and Continuity are metaphysical

concepts. The forms which we observe are, as forms, breaches of both. Nevertheless from their gradations and relations the unity of Power of which they are manifestations is inferred. Union by *Sâdhanâ* with such essential Power gives direct experience (*Veda*) of the unitary essence which is displayed as Mind and Matter. Though the notion of Chit as the basis of all psychical modes, is still peculiar to India, Western Science and Philosophy are now commencing to distinguish between Mind and Consciousness, holding that below and above the surface Consciousness there is yet another. There is in us much more than that of which we are aware. The unity of Mind and its action as a whole is now recognised, as also that Mind is a Force. This is well established in Indian Doctrine which teaches its activity in perception, actually *going forth* to its object and its creative power as shown in the so-called occult faculties or *Siddhis*.

Speaking of this Mind-ray reminds me of a recent announcement that an instrument in the nature of an electroscope is to be shown at a forthcoming medical congress in proof of the statement that in vision a ray proceeds from the eye,—an old Indian notion. The hitherto

supposed gap between Mind and Matter is closing, thus rendering a transition from physical to psychical concepts easier. It is ancient Indian Doctrine that both Mind and Matter are modes of one and the same Substance, and as such related to and akin to one another, thus rendering all knowledge possible. Cognition is recognition.

Of the greatest importance is the change of ideas regarding the nature and constitution of Matter. India in the person of her great thinkers has never held to what Sir William Jones called the "vulgar notions of matter". Western Science now dematerialises Matter. The notion of real and lasting partitions between various forms of elementary matter is passing. The present tendency of science is towards the revival of the ancient Doctrine of one Substance-Energy, the Mahâshakti of the Vedantic Shâkta and the Prakriti of the Sâṅkhyas. All material forms are passing modes (*Vikriti*) of this one Power. *Mâyâ* becomes a possibility and not the absurdity which some have supposed it to be. Sâṅkhya is not a "chaotic impertinence" as the English Sanskritist Dr. Fitz Edward Hall, with the usual depreciation of things Indian, called it. On the

contrary, here as elsewhere the rational character of Indian doctrine is justified. The hitherto supposed gap between "living" and "non-living" substance is now by many denied. Both are forms of the One Power which in this aspect is *Prāṇah Prāṇasya*, the Life of all lives. In so-called "inorganic" substance that Form displays itself in certain restricted ways, and in organic substance in other ways of increasing freedom. As regards the evolution of "living" substance, the Indian notion has always been that the various forms of it differ only in degree and not in kind.

In future numbers of this series I hope to deal with Chit, the unchanging principle of all changing experience, Its Power (*Chit-Shakti* and *Mâyā-Shakti*) Unity, Causality, Continuity and the various manifestations of Power (Shakti) or modes of its Substance-Energy as Mind, Life and Matter.

But it is to be remembered that the Indian Quest has been and is a practical one—the quest of Happiness which all men seek. If it be true, as *Yoga* holds, that Man can by the appropriate method think and otherwise work himself out of the dualistic system of which he is a part, yet whilst he is in and of it, on the path of

Enjoyment (*Bhoga*) his thinking has its end in some form of action. In Shâkta teaching, *Yoga* and *Bhoga* are unified (*Yogo Bhogâyate*). Man gains every end in and through the finite yet real world—even those which are unworldly, in the striving for unity with the *Ens Realissimum* of which the world is an act of will. That action in the world will be powerful to effect his aims (and who does not want that ?) if he worships the infinite Mother Power, the Supreme and complete “I” (*Pûrnâham*) of which he is according to this teaching a contraction (*Sangkocha*) or form. By *Sâdhanâ* he makes contact and then unifies himself with the fundamental Grand Will. This Will reinforcing his own individual and contracted will, the “Little Doer” achieves all success.

Another and most important matter to be remembered is this.—It has recently been said (Hoernle “Studies in Contemporary Metaphysics,” 75) that “the Eastern doctrines of the veil of illusion over reality and of the elaborate ascetic regimen for Mind and Body by which the student must discipline himself for penetrating to the Reality behind the veil, have never profoundly affected the main current of Western thought. Most of the great Philoso-

phers of the West, certainly since the time of the Renaissance, have been men of the world as well as students and thinkers. They have never tried to be 'holy' men set apart from their fellows and the problems of contemporary life. They have not, even when they were professors, spent their days in Meditation and mortification of the flesh in order to achieve individually the blessedness of Union with the One".

These statements do not apply to the Middle Ages in the West. With the supposed "Veil of Illusion" this book deals. Shâkta doctrine does not favour an "ascetic regimen", except by "ascetic," we understand a self-controlled and ordered life. Says the Kulârnava Tantra (Ch. 1-V, 75, *et seq*) "Fools deceived by Thy *Mâyâ* hope to attain liberation by eating one meal a day, by fasting and other acts which emaciate the body. What liberation can such ignorant ones get by the torture of the body? Donkeys go about naked, are they therefore *Yogîs*? If liberation is to be had by smearing oneself with mud and ashes then village dogs who roll therein are *Yogins*. Deer and other animals live on grass leaves and water, are they therefore *Yogins*? Hogs are exposed to cold wind and heat. To them all food fit and unfit are alike.

Are these then *Yogins*? Oh Kuleshwari all such practices deceive. The only direct cause of liberation is knowledge of the Truth (*Tattva-jñāna*). It again affirms that, in Kaula Dharma, *Bhoga* (Enjoyment and Suffering) is converted into Yoga (*Yogo bhogāyate*) and the world is made the seat of liberation (*Mokshāyate sangsārah*).

The end which is beyond the life of earth is achieved in it. It is not the fugitive but the *Vīra* (hero) who meets life face to face, who conquers all vain fears and ignorance and achieves. He is *Vīra* who struggles with *Avidyā*. By what man falls, by that he rises. But in common with other Indian systems, it holds that by reason and speculation alone Reality, in its sense as the Supreme Experience, is not attained. For this, *Sādhana* as physical, intellectual and moral purification, self-control, discipline, and worship are necessary. Without these the doctrine is not, even in an intellectual sense, rightly apprehended, still less is the Truth realised. Man must *transform* his nature to attain it. This involves right activity (*Kriyā*) with awareness of, and self-identification in all functions with, the indwelling Mother-Power: "She I am" "*Sa'ham*" he says. •

It has been said 'in the West (and this is Indian doctrine) that there is no end to what the trained and tutored will can do; and that because if a man puts himself in line with the Forces of Life he can tap reservoirs of Power, the contents of which are bottomless, because they are co-extensive with the Universal Life. This is the meaning of two terms common in the Tantra, namely, *Yoginîpriya* (Beloved of the *Yoginîs*) *Yoginî-pashu* (slave of the *Yoginîs*). The *Yoginîs* are the *Devatâ* aspect of the Forces of Nature or *Āvarana Devatâs* of the *Mahâ-yoginî*, the supreme *Mahâmâyâ Tripura-sundarî*. Work with them and success is attained. Work against them and ill fortune follows. Identify the self with the partial aspects which are the *Yoginîs* and then various Powers (*Siddhi*) are attained. Identify the self with the *Mahâyoginî* Herself and Man is liberated, for He is no longer man but Her. This is the Shâkta teaching, come down from days when India was a *Siddha Bhûmi*. With what a man should identify himself, depends upon what he wants. But whatever it is, he gets the Power, if he but wills and works for it.

In conclusion I wish to express my thanks to my friend Professor Pramathanâtha

Mukhyopâdhyâya for the help he has given me in the preparation of and in revising this and the forthcoming volumes, in which latter I hope to include some valuable notes of his on their subject.

Calcutta
14th July 1921. }

J. W.

THE WORLD AS POWER REALITY

I

It is a common notion concerning the Hindus that they are an unpractical people, without "grip on reality," believing life to be a "dream." This estimate is supposed to receive corroboration from the fact of their political dependence and to be in some degree the justification of it. Their Religion and Philosophy is said to be accountable for these alleged defects and their results. False philosophies and religions have (it is supposed) impeded India in the path of what its critics consider to be self-realisation. That there has been a lack of dynamism is obvious enough, for otherwise things would not be what they are. Therefore is needed the worship of

Shakti or Power. There has been in some quarters a lack of faith, of belief, of self-confidence which is life and the issue of Life. How wonderful is the saying of that unnamed sage (to which I will in another volume return) which is quoted by Punyānanda and Bhāskararāya in their Commentaries on the Yoginīhridaya, and Nityāshodashikā Tantras.

*Apūrnammanyatā vyādhih kārpanyaika-
nidānabhūh*

“Sense of imperfection is disease and the sole source of every misery.” But does not the Vedānta speak of the *Pūrṇa*, the *Whole* which is both Health and Life lasting? Is it the fact that Indian philosophy and religion are responsible? This is a large question, the answering of which would involve very many inquiries extending over a large field. Here I am concerned with one only. To me the Hindu typical-mind has a profound sense of reality, both as universe and its ground.

The power of ideas is immense and the greatest of all powers. But we must not

over-exaggerate the influence on man at large of the technical discussions of professional philosophers. This is above all true of the philosophical issue, so long and even now agitated, namely as to the reality of the world of objects, as to the real nature of the "Real," as to what is real and unreal in experience, and so on. The reality of the universe is imposed even on philosophers, notwithstanding their arguments. For both they and the common folk form part of and perceive it. The difference between these two classes, in India as elsewhere, lies in this, that the reality of the world, in the technical sense of "Reality" as understood in the West, is taken for granted by the latter, who pursue their avocations unworried by self-created difficulties, whilst some at least of the former in the West have been engaged in the task of endeavouring to show that the things which we perceive are not really what we perceive them to be. Indian philosophic thought preserves the reality of the object experienced, whilst making full allowance for the influence in the act

of perception of individual mental characteristic and tendencies called *Saṅskâras*, until that stage of cosmic consciousness (called *Hiranyagarbha*) is attained in which Reality as the Universals or Generals of the sense-particulars (*Tanmâtras*) is experienced. Beyond this is Perfect Experience as *Îshvara* and then Pure *Samvit* Itself. In the *Hiranyagarbha* subsumed by *Îshvara* there is still the limiting *Saṅskâra* which while allowing perfect experience of the universals, yet precludes a perfect experience of the whole cosmic dynamism of things and their relations. This limitation is removed in the stage of *Îshvara* in which there is not only a perfect experience of effects (*kâryya*) *as they are* but of causes *as they are*. There is no question of noumenal and phenomenal aspects but rather of causal and effectual aspects; nor is there a question of an unknowable background as in Western Science. Both aspects are actually known by us imperfectly; the effectual by *Hiranyagarbha* perfectly; both causal and effectual by *Îshvara* perfectly.

Western thought has endeavoured to show that things are not what they appear to be, that is, they are in fact other than what they seem. We are thus said to live in "appearances" of "things in themselves," unknowable yet existing in their own right. The sense-data are mere effects, produced in a perceiver's mind by the action on the sense organs of material objects, conceived in terms of imperceptible and hence hypothetical particles and forces. According to the Indian idea here described it is affirmed that things are *as things* what they appear to be. There is no "thing in itself" and therefore no appearance of it. The individual's perception of a thing is however subject to the limitations of his sense-capacity and of his *Sangskâras*. The Western view is—"What I see as green is objectively not green at all, but an hypothetical vibration of an hypothetical Ether." But according to Indian doctrine greenness is objective: though this greenness may be perceived by me subject to my *Sangskâras* or prenatal tendencies and conditions of sense-capacity. The

standard thing or the standard quality is not an unknowable extra-mental X, but the standard experience of a perfect Experiencer *Īshvara* or *Hiranyagarbha*. *Īshvara*'s experience is the "thing in itself" and of the "thing in itself"; my experience is an actual participation in His subject to my own limitations. There is thus no difference (as in the West) between "thing in itself" and "appearance" (which latter does not resemble the former), but between standard or perfect experience on the one hand and varied individual experience, subject to limitations, on the other. The Vedānta says that things are forms of, or appearances backed by, a Spiritual Reality which is not a thing at all. But so far as any thing is a thing, we know it, subject to our limitations, for what it is. The Real has three bodies, causal, subtle, and gross of which the former is the common source of the other two, which constitute the world of subtle and gross objects. Experience in each of these bodies is direct and real. Scientific doctrine has not this reality of experience.

For the perceived is substituted the inferred, and some of this inference is (when not unsound) either based on slender evidence or mere hypothesis. Inference is not the experience of the real. It may be wholly error. In applied science we live in a real world. But theoretical science and metaphysic may, as regards the inferred ultimate nature of things, be without truth, the correspondence of the real. In such matters an idolatry of Science is amongst the most foolish. Nevertheless it is a fact that Science is putting forward to-day theories which, if without meaning as applied to the physical world alone, nevertheless tend to establish the truth, which gives them meaning. Thus when it attributes unity, conservation, and continuity to Matter, Energy, and Motion in an universe of obvious plurality and discontinuity (since every form is a real breach of it) what it is in fact doing is to show that none of its conceptions have any meaning, except on the assumption of the unity and unmoving continuity of Consciousness in the sense of the Vedāntic Chit.

Indian thought affirms the truth (in its grade) of experience whether empirical or transcendental. Mere speculation as to the nature of either as inferred by reasoning or sense data leads at best to a conclusion of probability. The only certitude is in direct Experience itself. Nothing useful is gained in attempting to prove that that experience is in itself not real, or is an appearance of some thing unperceived. If we would know what some other than ordinary experience is, we must actually shift not our speculative thought on to it but our being into it. In other words we must have that experience directly. When we have made the shift, the experience which we have left is of no concern to us. But even if it were, it would not appear to be false but to be the relative truth of the stage at which it was had. It is "corrected" only in and for the next experience of the Real. Whilst on the plane of material experience, sense-data, inference, and reasoning take their part in raising the self to its own higher Self and its experiences. There is no magic carpet which

wafts the self from one stage to the other. But it is only a part of the *Sâdhanâ* as moral conduct, self discipline and ritual worship which are the necessary preliminary of Yoga through reasoning (*Jnâna*), feeling (*Bhakti*) or action (*Karma*). Truth is given us in our awareness of the world, for as we see it so it really is for us. There are higher experiences than this. But if they are to be had, the whole subjective being and its material body must be so actually *transformed* as to enable such experiences to be had. In other words we must experience reality whatever be its aspect—and not merely discuss it.

Contrary to common belief, Hindu thinkers have been and are (in an epistemological sense) not only Realists but Realists of a thorough-going type. There is no trace of the Subjectivism which may be found in the Buddhist schools. I have used the term "Realism," because it can be described, for the present purpose, in a clear way as the doctrine which holds that the world of objects is real in the sense that they exist independently of the consciousness of the

person who experiences them. The vast bulk of the people of India are as "naively realistic," as the rest of the world. Nor have they the mental malady which doubts the obvious and seeks for anything but a plain account of things. Theirs is the great common sense which means mankind-sense; even though like every thing which is human, it is not free from error. Common-sense is the sense of Reality in its material form. I am not however here concerned with popular but with philosophic Indian thought. By "Indian" I mean Brahmanical or, to use a popular term, Hindu. In fact one of the great cleavages between Brahmanical and Buddhist thought concerns this philosophical question of Reality, either as the Constant Centre of experience, or the universe which is the object of its experience. If the charge made can be laid at the door of any philosophy or religion, it is at that of some forms of Buddhism. For the very mark of Brahmanism is reality and practicality in doctrine and discipline. "Realism" in the Western sense is the doctrine that reality

exists apart from its presentation to, or conception by, consciousness. The realist believes that in sense-perception we have assurance of the presence of reality distinct from the modifications of the perceiving mind and existing independently of perception. *This is the Hindu position.* In Epistemology or theory of knowledge the Idealist asserts, after the manner of the Buddhist, that the reality of the world is its perceptibility. *This the Hindu denies.*

With this definition of "Realism" no harm is done by the employment of a technical Western term. Descriptive names given to Western systems of thought are not seldom in themselves ambiguous and often actually misleading when applied to Indian doctrine. They have their utility as a species of shorthand for the description of Western systems and serve a purpose when we endeavour to compare Western and Eastern thought. But care must always be taken in their use. "Realism" even in Europe does not always connote the same thing. Idealism again is a vague term. In the metaphysical sense,

Idealism is the name given to any theory which maintains the Universe to be throughout the work or the embodiment of Reason or Mind.¹ In this metaphysical sense of the term, that is as opposed to materialism, all the Six Philosophies may be described as idealistic, for none of them are materialistic.² In an *epistemological* sense the Hindus are *Realists*. In the *metaphysical* sense, some of their systems, such as the Sâṅkhya and Vedānta have been called Idealistic. The former may perhaps be so described, if a system which derives matter from things mental can be so called. It is certainly not (as has been said)³ materialistic. It sounds strange to call a system materialistic which derives matter from thoughts and

1. See Baldwin. Phil. Dict. *sub. voc.*

2. The first standard or Nyāya-vaisheshika has been called "Hindu Realism" and in several senses it is so. It is however not materialism and cannot be called Idealism in so far as its creation is a conjunction of previously existing realities.

3. By Prof. Garbhe. Samkh. Phil. 242 : *et seq.* Prof. Max Muller called it a system of Idealism, "Six Systems." X.

ideas and such an estimate is ⁴ absolutely against the universal tradition of the Hindus who, notwithstanding their assiduous critics, may be at least allowed to know what their own systems mean. For this reason, the Indian author last cited calls it Psycho-dynamism, inasmuch as the Principles which it regards as the origin of things are both psychical, that is, in the nature of feelings, thoughts and ideas, and dynamic, that is of the nature of forces or powers. The Vedânta again differs fundamentally from such idealistic Western systems as those of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, in that (amongst other things) the Vedântic Cause of the universe is not Mind or Reason as those terms are understood in the West but *Chit* (of which Mind is only a limited mode) and its Power or Shakti. It is better then in all cases to avoid Western terms except where they are nearly adequate, or comparison calls for them. We can most accurately describe Indian systems by

4. As pointed out by J. C. Chatterjee in "Hindu Realism," 14.

avoidance of labels, and by stating what in fact they say, leaving others to docket them in their Histories of Philosophy, if they will.

The belief to the contrary of that which I have expressed is I think in part due to the fact that the most talked-of system in the West is the Monistic Vedânta of the School of Shangkarâchâryya, and in part to a lack of understanding of this system, which presents some difficulties to the European mind. Even in India there are, I believe, at the present day but few who are really masters of it.

II

The chief orthodox systems of Brahmanism are known as the Six Darshanās or "Means of seeing,"⁵ because what the West calls Philosophy is that which gives men sight of sensible verities and enables them to understand in the light of Reason the super-sensible Truth attainable only through Veda, that is, the super-sensible *standard* experience of the Rishis⁶ or Seers. Philosophy habits this experience, so far as may be, in its rational dress.

These six systems may for the purpose of metaphysics be grouped into three, viz., (1) Nyâya-vaisheshika, (2) Sāṅkhya-Yoga, (3) Vedānta.⁷ This last term means Up-

5. Darshana comes from the root "*Drish*" "to see" that is to know.

6. Rishi also comes from the same root "to see" for they saw as Seers, that is had experience (Jñāna) of super-sensible truths.

7. This is the Uttaramīmāṃsā. The Pūrva or Dharma Mīmāṃsā's metaphysical basis belongs to the first group.

anishad. As such it must be distinguished from the various interpretations of it which are given by the Vedântic philosophical schools.

All these systems teach the empirical reality of the external world. In fact Shangkarâchâryya to whom the doctrine of the "unreality" of the world is attributed, emphatically affirms, in his polemic against the Subjectivism of the Buddhists, that matter is every whit as real as the mind which perceives it. The first of these groups teaches the absolute reality (that is, independence of the universe) of its nine eternally existing ultimate entities⁸, with their properties, relations and so forth; the second, the absolute reality or the independence of the universe of its ultimate root as the evolving Material Cause⁹ associated with Efficient Cause¹⁰ or Consciousness, the two Realities of this system; and the third, which is sub-divided into two general divisions, teaches in

8. Dravya : post.

9. Mûlaprakriti : v. post.

10. Purusha which is Chit.

the first of these divisions that the universe in ultimate resort is real, not as independent, but as part of the *one* ultimate Reality or Brahman ; whilst the Mâyâvâda Vedânta, which is the sole system of the second division and is regarded by its adherents as the crown of all doctrines, teaches that the universe, whilst empirically real, is in the transcendental sense neither "real" nor "unreal", nor partly either, but is backed up and made apparently substantial by this one Reality ; which, though It is (relative to us) Being-Bliss-Consciousness¹¹ and Lord,¹² is in Itself beyond all mind and speech (which, however, does not make It *unknowable*).

These Six Systems are really One System,¹³ containing three chief presentments or Standards of Indian Thought suitable to various types and grades of mind, which Standards, in themselves, mark stages of

11. Sachchidânanda.

12. Īshvara.

13. Some correspondences between the Six Systems are given in the following notes with a view to explaining the statement that they are each a presentment of the one standard Truth.

advance towards the understanding by the mind of the beyond-mind standard experience of the Seers or Rishis. Those who regard them according to notions of historical succession only will not accept this. They will also further point to the controversies of the adherents of each of the philosophical and religious schools. It is however the Indian notion which is expressed by Shiva who says ¹⁴ "The Six Doctrines ¹⁵ are My Six Limbs ¹⁶ (that is they form the unity of His Intellectual Body). He who separates them one from another severs my limbs (that is the unity of His Body). These also are the Six Limbs of Kula.'¹⁷ Shiva is the all-knowing Supreme Consciousness¹⁸, and Mind ¹⁹ is a mode of it. The Six Philosophies are the Six Minds or Six Ways in which *intellectual*

(14) Kulārṇava Tantra, II-84, 85.

(15) Darshana : commonly called the Six (orthodox) Philosophies.

(16) Two legs and feet, belly or trunk, two arms, hands and head.

(17) The community and doctrine of the Tantrik school called Kaulas. Kula=Shakti. Akula=Shiva. He who is Līna in both is Kulīna or Kaula.

(18) Chit.

(19) Antahkarana or inner instrument.

approach is made to that Full or Whole Experience,²⁰ a state which transcends mind and its operations. This Indian notion is essentially a true one. It is unaffected by succession in time, or by the fact that each adherent of a system is taught²¹ and believes that his system is the truth and would argue others out of theirs. It is necessary that this should be so, because only that can be received which the particular mind is capable of receiving. That is *its* truth. And that only can be held and lead to practical result in which one has faith. One stage is not contradictory of another, because each are stages complete and true in themselves, as representative of a particular psychic development, of which the doctrine held is the corresponding expression. Absolute truth consists in this, that it is impossible of correction. But the stages being relative are in a sense corrected; not in the sense

(20) Pârna ; which is the Immense or Brahman which is theologically God.

(21) See my Essay on the alleged " Conflict of Shâstras " in the " Indian Philosophical Review."

that they fail according to a standard applicable to the stage of particular development for which they are appropriate; but because the mind, enriched and transformed in its continuing advance, moves towards another and truer attitude and standpoint.

The Six Systems then are not wholly separate and mutually contradictory as commonly supposed, but are a graduated series in which the three groups form three great Standards suited to different types or grades of mind—different intellectual capacities and temperaments.²² What system any individual should follow depends on his competency or *Adhikâra*, a very fundamental doctrine of Brahmanism. To each is given the truth of his stage. When acquired, the mind naturally ascends to the next until, by the elimination of all which is accidental, it passes into the one essential stageless Reality.²³ When therefore it is said that the Six form one system,

(22) See "Hindu Realism," 5, *et seq.*

(23) See my Essay in the "Indian Philosophical Review" "On the Alleged Conflict of Shâstras."

reference is not made to their historical genesis. The relation is not temporal but logical. They are stages in a process of immanent logic of the Reason realising itself as the true expression (so far as may be) in mind of supermental experience. The former cannot truly represent the latter, but some systems of thought make nearer approach to it than others. Classification by time is superficial. One system may ante-date or post-date another but what is essential is its character as being more or less advanced in the process of self-realisation.

In all these systems the world as a combination of elements is a passing thing, it being a common Hindu notion that nothing which is produced (and the universe as we know it is that) lasts for ever. Into what is it resolved? What are or is its fundamental Realities or Reality? This leads to a short survey of the teachings of the Six Systems on this point.

III

If we reflect on the nature of ultimate Reality or Realities, the most obvious division which suggests itself is that of the Experiencer and Experienced, of the conscious Selves and the world of objects together with their various properties and relations.

On the subjective side there is Consciousness and Mind, for none of the Indian systems fails to distinguish the one from the other. We know ourselves as conscious beings. Consciousness is recognised by the First Standard²⁴ as a property and as such must inhere in some Reality which is independent of the body, since it is not the latter's property for several reasons which

(24) As to what follows the English reader may consult "Hindu Realism" by J. C. Chatterjee and others. To those who know Bengali Rajendra Ghose's work on this System is recommended.

this *Shâstra* develops. We may only note here the view that if Consciousness cannot be the property of the body as a whole, neither can it be a mere function of the brain, the brain theory of Consciousness being open to the same objections as the one which maintains that consciousness is a property of the body as a whole.²⁵ In fact consciousness belongs to what feels itself to be possessor of the body and makes use of the body. But as in all the other Standards, a distinction is drawn between Consciousness and Mind.²⁶ The Âtman or Self is the basis of Consciousness and experience. It is not limited but is all-pervading and present everywhere. But we observe that the Self does not always perceive an object, even when the latter is in relation with a sense or senses by which it is perceived. Therefore the Self requires something else for perception, namely, attention in which case only perception of

(25) See Chandrakānta Tarkāṅkāra Lectures on Hindu Philosophy, II. 174.

(26) Manas. In this case between Manas and the Self or âtman whose property is consciousness and mind.

the object takes place. Moreover mind is wanted to enable the self to have experience, not simultaneously of all things at once but in succession. For these and other reasons the necessarily limiting function of moving atomic mind in relation to unmoving all-pervading Self, and the separate real existence of mind is shown. As consciousness is not the property of the body, neither is it the property of and one with the senses, life or mind. Mind and senses are instruments of Consciousness. Thoughts, ideas and feelings are generally called Mind in the West, but the Self as sustainer of consciousness is not any of these. For they are in continual change and are known and experienced as changing things in much the same way as the body and its changes are known and experienced. Being so experienced they are not the experiencer. We are here on ground common in general to all the Standards, the main distinction being that in this Standard the Self or Âtman is the Reality in which all consciousness inheres, and consciousness is not its essential cha-

racteristic as in Sāṅkhya and Vedānta. We thus get two ultimate Realities on the side of Perception: for the senses are made up of the four minima ²⁷ of discrete things perceived by the senses, and though real are not original ultimate realities.

Then what is perceived? What is perceived is Matter with its properties and relations and so forth, now moving, now held in position in space. Matter is real, its properties and relations are real, and so are time, motion and space. The sensible world is thought to be five-fold, for it affects our senses in five different ways. As the Standard does not admit a common Substance with varying form, matter is constituted by a number of separate independently existing Realities. Matter has certain general qualities ²⁸ which correspond to a certain extent to what European Philosophy calls the primary qualities which may be perceived by more senses than one: as also certain special

(27) Paramānu.

(28) Sāmānya guna.

qualities²⁹ which can each be perceived by a certain sense only and correspond to some of the so-called secondary qualities of Western Philosophy. But if external things exist, they must do so independently of the percipient, for that is their Reality. Their qualities are really inherent in them and not in the percipients. Nor can it be said, as some do in the West, that some properties are inherent and objective and others subjective. For the arguments which prove that some properties are objective will also prove that the rest are so. As further explained later the theory of perception is fully "realistic." The four special qualities which affect the four corresponding senses are odour, taste, colour, and the touch sense. Sound in this standard is not regarded as a property of the discrete sensible things, there being no such thing from which sound cannot be entirely eliminated; yet sound as a quality can have no independent existence of its own, nor is it purely subjective. It inheres

(29) Vishesha guna.

in the Reality called Ether (*Ākāsha*) though not possessing exactly the same qualities as the Ether of modern Western science. Things move in it and produce sounds not in themselves but in the medium in which they move. There are thus four classes of Minima of those moving things which are discrete and are perceived by the senses, each of which is eternal and changeless and a fifth Reality the ethereal motionless *Ākāsha* in which they are. These Minima or Paramānus have been called ³⁰ misleadingly "Atoms." For the latter have in Western chemistry some magnitude, whilst the four classes of Paramānus are non-spatial and absolutely without any magnitude whatever. Unlike many, if not most, schools of Realism in the West there is no Hindu system of realistic thought which has ever held that the essential basis of the sensible world is a something or somethings which must have magnitude and extension. The ultimate constituents of sensible things are

(30) As pointed out in "Hindu Realism."

real but not hard solid particles with magnitude—a conclusion towards which Western investigation with its “dematerialization” of Matter now tends. The Minima combine to form sensible matter, the pure points standing themselves away from one another but being united mediately through the intervening ether which is itself a non-discrete Reality or continuum in touch with all discrete things. Each of these four classes of Paramânu, as the origin of a special quality perceived by a special single sense, is also the origin of the particular sense itself, namely, the senses commonly called “touch,” sight, taste, and smell. That is the special senses are essentially of the same nature as the ingredients or originators of the qualities themselves. It is thus important to remember that according to the Hindu theory of Perception the senses are essentially of the same nature as the originators of the qualities which are perceived by them. These senses perceive all perceptible things as moving, changing, coming into existence, and passing out of it. This

standard has no such notion of inherent causal efficiency as is held by the second. It holds that the things themselves as things cannot do all this. Motion is communicated by the First Mover who is separate from that which He moves. Discrete things have no power of self origination and movement—even if they had, we should not see the orderly movement which is in the universe unless there were some Power which makes this orderly movement and seasonable origination and distinction of things possible. But we not only see things moving and changing, but they hold relative positions to one another, that is, are held together in their positions and must therefore be conceived as being acted upon by a Power which works in a direction opposite to that in which the power of movement works. This movement or *Kāla* produces all relations which are called temporal and so is in this sense Time. The other principle or *Dik* by which discrete things are held in relative position produces notions of spatial direction. Space and Time have an

objective existence irrespective of the mind thinking about them. The relations which they produce are as real as the things related. They are relations of the real separate things.

Of Entities (*Dravya*) or as they are sometimes translated Substances, there are thus (both subjective and objective) nine.³¹ These with their qualities or properties, movements or actions, and species, particular, inherent inseparable relation, and negation³² are known as the seven *Padârthas* or Categories under which everything which can be imagined are classed. All

(31) Âtman, Manas, Paramânu (4) Âkâsha, Kâla, Dik.

(32) Guna, Karma, Sâmanya Vishesha, Samāvaya (as of quality with substance, action with substance, part with whole) Abhāva. Gunas are 24 in number and are Nitya and Anitya. ~~origins~~ 5, Sâmanya (3) Vishesha many, Samāvaya Abhāva 2 again divided into three. According to ~~is~~ ~~ada~~ there were only 6 Padârthas, Abhāva being omitted. That in which they inhere (âdhāra) are Dravya in the case of Guna, Karma, Vishesha; Dravya, Guna, Karma in the case of Sâmanya and Samāvaya; and Abhāva may be related to anything in Svarūpa Sambanda. According to Vedānta, Shakti is different from these. The Nyāya includes Shakti or Power in Abhāva as the negation of obstruction hindering production of effect (Prati-bandhakābhāva). Īshvara has Nityajñāna, Nitya ichchhā, Nitya kriyā. These three properties are called the Shaktis of Īshvara.

these entities, properties, relations and so forth are real.

Dealing with the Entities (*Dravya*) there are in the Nyâya-vaisheshika, the first and simplest of the three stages of philosophical development, on the one hand the Selves,³³ the basis of consciousness and experience, or that in which consciousness inheres, together with the Mind or instrument of their experience,³⁴ and, on the other hand, the four essential subtle objects of experience³⁵ from which are produced the gross perceptible objects of experience together with the ethereal medium³⁶ in which all discrete and separated things exist. To these it adds *Kâla* the Principle of universal movement bringing, according to general Hindu ideas, things

(33) *Âtmans*. These correspond (when I use this word here or elsewhere I do not imply that the notions are identical : on the contrary) to the *Purushas* of the *Sāṅkhya-Yoga* and to the one *Âtman* of the *Vedānta*.

(34) *Manas*. This, as an instrument of experience, corresponds to the *Antahkarana* of the other systems of which *Manas* is one particular function.

(35) *Paramāṇus*. Their place is taken in the other system by the *Tanmātras* or supra-sensible matter.

(36) *Âkāśa* : given as such medium in all the schools.

into existence, subjecting them to change and carrying them out of existence, giving rise in the percipient to the notion of Time;³⁷ and *Dik* the Principle which, notwithstanding the impulse of the former, holds things together in their various relative positions giving rise in the percipient to the notion of relative position as "here and there," "near and far" in Space.³⁸ In this system however neither Time nor Space are mere notions. They are *Dravya* or Entities that is something independently real, and self-subsisting. Confusion has arisen from the supposition

(37) *Kāla*. In the Pancharâtra Tantras also time is defined as "the mysterious power which urges on and matures everything." It is three-fold as Supreme, Subtle, Gross. Transcendental Time is traced back to Veda and is referred to in the saying *Kālah kâle nayati mām* "Time leads me in time." This is *Akhandā Kala* or Time without sections. See Dr. Schrader's *Introd. Ahir-budhnya Sanghitā* 65. As to time as a form of perception (*Anschauungsform*) in the Pancharâtra see Schrader *Op. cit.*—71) where also he says that the idea of spatial transcendence was known to them and others. As to the two higher standards v. *post*.

(38) It is a part of the function of *Niyati* in the 36 *Tattvas* accepted by *Shaivas* and *Shāktas*, *v. ib.*, and my "Studies in *Mantra Shāstra*". *Dik* is spatial position as to which see *post*.

that *Kāla* and *Dik* mean Time and Space in the general Western sense of those terms.³⁹ Western Realists have also maintained that Time and Space have an existence irrespective of the mind thinking about them, with the result that all necessary relations drawn from knowledge may also be regarded as having a reality independent of the mind reflecting on them. This does not mean according to Western Realism that they have existence as individuals or independent of the things related. But they have just such reality as we are intuitively led to believe them to have; that is, they exist as necessary relations of the separate things.⁴⁰ According to the Nyāya-Vaisheshika Darshana, *Kāla* is a general principle of movement and *Dik* is a power which acts in exactly a contrary way, that is, by holding things together in a particular posi-

(39) See J. C. Chatterji's "Hindu Realism," 54 et seq. where the point is discussed.

(40) See Dr. J. McCosh. "First and Fundamental truths," 185.

tion. It is not Space in the sense of room⁴¹ and is in the nature of spatial direction. Each Reality has only general relation with everything which moves or is held in position. They are both, as realities, distinct from the things in and upon which they operate: but as so operating they give rise in the percipient to the notion of relations called Time and Spatial position.

The imperceptible *Paramânu*s or things of no magnitude produce perceptible things with magnitude.⁴² In this system the World as a compound of these lasting eternal elements is real since it exists independent of experience. Its ultimate constituents are self-subsisting and independent of all perceiving entities or selves.

During dissolution⁴³ there exist all the

(41) This is Âkâsha in which Dik operates. Space as extension or locus of finite body (Sthityâdhâra) is called Desha.

(42) Just as the infra-sensible Tanmâtras of the other standards give rise to the Bhûtas and their compounds as sensible matter.

(43) Pralaya.

*Padârthas*⁴⁴ except non-eternal compound-
ed substance, non-eternal qualities or pro-
perties and action or motion.⁴⁵ Where there
is more than one thing there must exist
some sort of relation.⁴⁶ The Selves or
Âtmans⁴⁷ (in whom is their *Adrishta*)⁴⁸ and
their *Manas*⁴⁹ exist unconsciously, that is,
without experience. The Paramânus with
their *Adrishta*⁵⁰ exist without motion in
*Âkâsha*⁵¹ and *Kâla* and *Dik*⁵² are inopera-

(44) See p. 29. Including Abhâva there are seven categories or Padârthas here spoken of, but different schools of Dârshanikas classify Padârtha differently. The Mâyāvâdins say two (Chit, Achit), the Râmânujas three (Chit, Achit, Îshvara), the Mâdhvas have two (Svatantra, Paratantra), Nâkulishas three (Pati, Pashu, Pasha).

(45) That is the Nitya Dravya, Nitya gunas, Sâmanya, Vishesha, Samâvâya. There is Abhâva of Kârnya and no Karma. Anitya (non-Eternal) Dravyas are everything beginning with the Dvyanukas of Prithivî, Âpah, Tejah, Vâyu. The rest are, including the Paramânus, nitya (Eternal).

(46) Here called Samyoga-vishesha-sambandha.

(47) See p. 30.

(48) The product of past Karma and the cause of future Karma. Adrishta as a Guṇa cannot be ever separated from the Âtman.

(49) See p. 49.

(50) These have their Sangskâras. All Matter has its appropriate behaviour due to inner tendency or Sangskâra.

(51) See p. 30,

(52) Srishti.

tive. Īshvara alone is eternally conscious, willing and active but without production of the universe. At creation⁵³ Īshvara makes the *Adrishta* of the Ātmans operative and conjoins the *Ātmans*, ever associated with their *Manas*⁴⁹ in such wise that the Selves become Conscious and have experience of sensible Matter, ⁵³ the *Adrishta* of which is also made operative, upon which they are active after their nature, have motion, combine as *Dvyanuka* and then as *Trasarenu*, that is, combinations of the *Dvyanukas* or six "atoms" which is the smallest sensible matter of three dimensions.

The second and more advanced Standard or *Sāṅkhya-yoga* asks whether, in an analysis of the World, we cannot reduce it to a lesser number of Realities than the nine Entities with their properties and relations, namely, Consciousness and Mind on the one hand, and on the other the four elements of matter in space, now moved, now held in position? It answers that we can. We can keep Consciousness and Mind

(53) Compounded of the ultimate *Minima* or *Paramānu*.

and include the rest under the common heading Matter and attribute the latter's motions and positions to its own inherent energies. We thus get three things—Consciousness, Mind and Matter. In the World we see constant change and we experience a continuity of consciousness as an unchanging Self. We see and experience both Consciousness and Unconsciousness. The two chief concepts then which claim our attention are Consciousness, Unconsciousness, Changelessness, and Change. Examination shows that the first differs fundamentally from the second and belongs to a category of its own, that is, it must be regarded as a separate and different reality from the rest. Why? Because our intuition of Consciousness is of its continuity. It is true that some speak of the "stream" of consciousness, but examination shows that it is not unlimited consciousness which moves but the limited mind which is associated with it and is its instrument. Notwithstanding all apparent change, we are conscious of a persisting spaceless and timeless Self which

gives meaning to all our notions of motion, change, space, and time. But whilst we know ourselves as consciousness we are aware of limitations upon it. Consciousness cannot as such limit Consciousness. It must then be something unconscious which does so. This something then is Mind. Mind certainly appears to be conscious, but this is so not because it is in fact Consciousness but because it is associated with, and backed by, Consciousness. Mind is a play of dark unconscious force which is lit up by Consciousness. Again Consciousness in itself is unlimited, but everything else which is not Consciousness, or so far as it is not so, is limited. Consciousness then is distinct from Mind and Matter in that the former is changeless, timeless, spaceless, unlimited, whilst Mind and Matter are changing things and (being things) limited in Time and Space.

The next question is—Consciousness being a distinct reality from Mind and Matter, are these last two separate realities or can they be reduced to one? They

can be so reduced if shown to have qualities in common bringing them under one general concept. We have seen that there are two such qualities. Each are *per se* unconscious. Consciousness is unlimited and all-pervading and therefore immanent (however veiled) in Mind and Matter. But abstractedly considered and by themselves, Mind and Matter are unconscious. Again they are both changing. We observe matter in constant change. So also the mind changes, its instability being compared to mercury. In fact motion, as both Aristotle and the Hindus say, is the essential characteristic of Nature. For this reason the world is called in Sanskrit "*Jagat*" which means the "moving thing." The universe is Mind and Matter in constant movement (*Spanda*), not a single particle being even for one moment at rest. Throughout all this movement the Self remains as the one unchanged Consciousness, the static centre of this other Reality which is many, changing, and unconscious. Both Matter and Mind, which move in and around it are two aspects, the

first gross, and the second subtle, of one common Ground and Reality.

The Second Standard then reduces the many realities of the first into two, namely, the *Purushas* or Selves as Consciousness and *Prakriti* the source of both the mental and psychical as subject on the one hand⁵⁴ and the material as object⁵⁵ on the other. *Prakriti* the source of the world of mind and matter is a self-subsisting Entity independent of the Selves which, as being in themselves Consciousness, lighten and give the similitude of consciousness to its dark unconscious operations. She is active before Him because Nature always works for the Consciousness directed towards it. As *Prakriti* is real so also are its derivatives Mind and Matter, the latter including the whole universe of objects and the former all empirical subjects.

(54) The *Antahkarana* working with the aid of the senses or *Indriyas*. Consciousness is reflected on these because the natural Principle (*Prakriti*) and all its products are in themselves unconsciousness.

(55) Compound matter made up of the five forms of sensible matter (*Bhûta*) derived from the super-sensible *Tanmâtra*.

In this system the nine Realities of the previous one are dealt with as follows:— The place of the eternal, infinitely numerous selves or *Ātmans* is here taken by the eternal, infinitely numerous *Purushas* or Selves. But whereas the Vaisheshika *Ātman* is a Reality of which consciousness is not an essential, inalienable characteristic but is that in which Consciousness is only sustained, the *Purushas* are Pure Consciousness (Chit) Itself. All the other eight Realities of the former system are assigned to, and included within *Prakriti*, the non-conscious Principle. The place of *Manas* is taken by the inner instrument or *Antahkarana*⁵⁶ by which finite experience is had;⁵⁷ and the place of the four *Paramānus* and *Ākāsha* is taken by the five *Tanmātras* or five forms, of super-sensible "Matter" or universals, which in combination produce the particulars which

(56) This term includes *Buddhi*, *Ahaṅkāra*, *Manas* which operate with the aid of the outer instruments, the senses, between which and the first two *Manas* is the link.

(57) Through a form of catalytic activity: that is by the reflection of consciousness on it.

are sensible matter.⁵⁸ *Kāla* as "Time" has no objective existence apart from the Moment⁵⁹ or ultimate and absolute unit of change, namely, the instantaneous⁶⁰ transit of a *Tanmātra* from one point in space to the next succeeding point. The moment is real, being identical with the unit of change in phenomena and the Time-relation thus shares in this reality. *Dik* as the totality of position, or as an order of co-existent points, is like order in time relative to the understanding, being constructed on the laws of actual relations of position intuited by empirical consciousness. Spatial position results from the different relations in which the all-pervasive Ether or *Ākāsha* stands to the various bounded objects in it. The category of Causality is mediated through the scheme of order in time. In short Space, Time, and Causality are empirical relations of

(58) Bhūta.

(59) Kshana.

(60) Lotze says " Nothing could conceivably have the power to interpose an interval of time, vacant as in that case it would be between cause and consequence."

things having objective empirical reality but not independent of the things so related.⁶¹ This standard teaches the efficiency, as inherent dynamism, of the world of things, since the Universe in all its forms is a manifestation of the Supreme Causal Energy-Substance Itself.

(61) See Dr. Seal's "Positive Sciences of the Hindus," 18-22.

IV

The third stage opens with the question whether it is possible to reduce the two Realities to one. At this point reason alone fails to establish the necessity of any such resolution. Perceiver and Perceived can only be unified in something which transcends both and therefore all empirical experience is something alien to it. Reason may doubtless establish conclusions of some probability, but it cannot be shown with certitude that the ultimate Reality is single whilst we still rest in present world experience. If we assume one of two Realities only we may reasonably fix on Consciousness which is self-directing rather than on unconscious matter, but that there is only one remains to be proved. Supreme unitary experience is known only by Consciousness divested of those conditioning limitations which are the very constituents of ordinary limited world ex-

perience, and which consciousness has thus expanded into that Immensity which is the meaning of the world Brahman. To know this One Reality directly is to be It. To know of It is learnt from those who have had unitary experience or have received the traditional teaching of such experiencers. Therefore it is that the Vedānta is essentially a *Shrutipradhāna* or revealed *Shāstra* as opposed to a *Yukti-pradhāna* or reasoning *Shāstra*. That there is one ultimate Reality is known by most only secondarily as the revelation of the Seers or Rishis who have "seen" this Truth, that is, have had direct⁶² experience of it in *Samādhi* or ecstasy; and primarily by such direct experience which is open to all who are qualified and strive to attain it. Spiritual experience varies. It may be of a more or less dualistic character or (for so long as it endures) Monistic. The great Vedic saying (*Mahāvākya*) "That thou art" (*Tat tvam asi*) has thus received varying interpretation. The word *Tat* (That) in

(62) Aparokshajnāna.

Sanskrit may stand for any case.⁶³ It may be read in the nominative, then meaning the identity of the Mâyâvâda school or of Râmânuja.⁶⁴ It may stand for other cases. *Tat* may mean *Tasmât* as in Vallabha's school—"the one from Whom all proceeds." *Tat* may mean *Tasya*, as in Mâdhva's school—"you are His."⁶⁵ "He is your Lord, you belong to, and depend on Him." *Tat* may mean *Tasmin*, *Tasmai* as in the case of other dualistic teachers (*Dvaitavâdins*) and devotees (*Bhaktas*). "He it is in Whom you live, with whom you must unite through devotion or It is for Him you are." "For Him you are produced and for Him you must work being in His service." Out and out dualists like the Naiyâyikas say "You are not That (*Atvat tvam asi*).

In the system taught by Râmânuja Nimbârka, Vallabha and Mâdhva, the

(63) See Bhâmatî Kalpataruparimala of Appaya Dîkshita sūtra 1. No school stands for the accusative or instrumental, each school puts forward its own Veda mantra.

(64) Tvam=here Angsha, "You are part of the whole."

(65) Svâmitva sambandha.

world in each case is real, but the Principle of which it is the manifestation is not independent and self-subsisting but dependent on or present in God as the *Ens Realissimum* in various ways, as either the Body of the Lord,⁶⁶ within His Lordship,⁶⁷ or as different⁶⁸ from the Lord as the possibility of distinct and dependent existence,⁶⁹ and yet not different as impossibility of independent existence,⁷⁰ or as one with God without recourse to any principle

(66) Rāmānuja. God thus stands to the world in the same relation as man's soul to his body.

(67) Svāmitva-sambandha. The three real entities in this system are the Supreme who controls (Niyāmaka), the enjoyer (Bhoktri) and the objects of enjoyment (Bhogyā). This system, in that it denies that God is a material cause of the universe, makes nearest approach to Christian theology. Union consists in making approach to and becoming like to God.

(68) Nimbārka.

(69) Para-tantra-sattā-bhāvah.

(70) Svatantra-sattā-bhāvah. Hence the doctrine is known as Bhedābheda "different yet not different." In the Śaiva Tantras of the Kashmir school (such as Svachchanda Tantra, Netra Tantra and others) and other Śāstras, Unity (Abheda) Diversity (Bheda) and Diversity in Unity (Bhedābheda) are also taught. Every Indian Śāstra shares ideas to be found in others (See "Kashmir Śaivism" by J. C. Chatterjee, 6.)

of *Mâyâ*,⁷¹ such as Shangkara teaches, being a part of Him as it were a spark thrown out by fire.⁷² In all these systems⁷³ God is the *Ens Realissimum*, and all other realities are in one way or another dependent on Him, though independent of the mind of the creature who perceives them. Being part of the Lord they share in His Reality. For a knowledge of this ultimate Reality all depend on *Shruti* or *Veda*, the teaching of which is interpreted in various ways. The interpretations differ and so do the spiritual experiences, but they are none the less true for that. They have the reality of all actual experience and the truth of their stage of experiencing. In spiritual progress man passes from out the lower to the higher experience, that is, an experience of great-

(71) Vallabha.

(72) Shangkarâchâryya denies absolute identity in this sense, for according to him the identity of the Supreme and individual self is only established after eliminating *Mâyâ* from the first and *Avidyâ* from the second.

(73) The Western reader who desires a short summary of these different schools may consult V.S. Ghatge "Le Vedânta E'tude sur les Brahma-sûtras."

er unity. The *standard* spiritual experience is that of the *Rishis* as embodied in the Vedas.

V

The third Standard or Vedânta consists of two main divisions. In the first is contained every school but that of Shangkarâchârya. His Mâyâvâda is the sole system of the second division. The ground of distinction consists in this, that he alone distinguishes between conventional and transcendental reality and truth. All Vedântic schools are at one in taking up the analysis at the point at which it was left by the previous standard. They do not altogether discard its findings but hold that one of its two Realities, *Prakriti* the Unconscious Form-principle, is not wholly independent of the other or Formless Consciousness or *Purusha*. Reality of the universe as the complete independence of the second Standard is denied, but another reality is given to the universe according

to the first division, namely, the reality of that of which it is a part or with which it is connected. According to the Vedânta of the second division this reality of the universe is empirical only, and from the transcendental standpoint is denied. The Vedânta thus in the continuous approach to unity reduces the two Realities of the second Standard to one Reality only.

The final step is taken by the Mâyavâda Vedânta on its transcendental side. Empirically it admits a real material causation by *Mâyâ* as the Power of the Lord, who is Being-Consciousness-Bliss, as also the reality of the world of Mind and Matter. If the cause be real the products must be so. Matter is every whit as real as Mind, is not the creation of the latter. The order of evolution of the *Jîva* or individual differs from that of the Sāṅkhya. But from the transcendental aspect, which is the standpoint of God, the world is without reality. The ultimate experience is not a world-experience. From the view point of the former's persistence, what comes and goes is unreal. There is here no infringe-

ment of Realist doctrine which affirms that matter exists independently of mind. This is fully recognised. But it is clear that in a state which transcends both, that is, in which there is neither Matter nor Mind, the question whether matter exists independently of mind cannot arise. There is no denial of the realistic position because a further form of experience is assumed where Realism, Subjectivism and the like have from the nature of the case no meaning. "Realism" assumes both Mind and Matter. So does the Advaitin Vedântist as regards World-experience. In the state which it assumes beyond World-experience the question does not arise.

It is this second division of the Vedântic schools occupied by one System only, namely, the Monistic *Mayâvâda* doctrine of Shangkarâchârya which has given rise to the notion that the Hindus think the world is unreal, though the vast number of ordinary folk can have no such notion and every other Indian philosophical school combats his teaching on this point. By its followers this school is regarded as the

crown of the whole series of thought-systems of which the Chârvakas and Lokâyatas, atheists and materialists, are at the other and the lowest end. The fundamental distinction between it and the other Vedântic systems lies in this, that whereas they in ultimate resort give to the universe reality, though dependent on Brahman of which it is in one sense or other a part, in this last system the manifold of the universe consists only of "Names and Forms"⁷⁴, which are no true part of the one and sole Reality or Brahman, whose presence gives the world the appearance of substantiality it possesses. They are the product of an inscrutable Power⁷⁵ of the Lord⁷⁶, who is Himself only the Immense or Brahman seen through the self-same veil of *Mâyâ*. In this way the sole Reality, in its sense of unchanging everlastingness, is affirmed.

The unreality of the world was the theme of some of the northern Buddhist

74. Nâma-rûpa.

75. Achintya-Shakti.

76. Īshvara.

schools,⁷⁷ who in this as in other matters deserted the path of good sense marked out by Brahmanism. The Tibetan word which answers to *Mâyâ*, when given the meaning of a magical and illusory show conjured up by a Magician, is *s-Gyuma*. It was Shangkarâchârya's object to refute these Buddhists and he, in so doing, gave an interpretation of Vedânta which, whilst in opposition to Buddhistic Idealism on the empirical plane, in that it asserted that matter was every whit as real as the mind which perceived it (and was therefore not the creation of mind), yet conceded the "unreality" (as his school defines the term "Real") of the universe from the transcendental standpoint.

That there is some similarity between his doctrine and that of the Buddhist *Mâyâ-vâda* was long ago perceived, as in the *Padma Purâna* which speaks of his system as a "bad doctrine and a covert form of

77. See my Introduction to the Buddhist Tantra *Shrichakrasambhara*, Vol. VII, Tantrik Texts, p. xv.

Buddhism.”⁷⁸ It is however equally obvious that there are also fundamental differences between the two doctrines, some of which we will shortly examine. In the first place, Shangkarâchârya held to the empirical reality of the world as existing independently of its percipient. Since the *Jîva* or Individual Centre produces his own *Sangskâras* or tendencies, there is, it is true, a sense in which we each make our own world. But in another sense the world exists independently, as the actualization of the collective *Sangskâras*. He conceded empirical reality to the waking and dreaming states and even to illusion⁷⁹ (strictly so called) whilst they lasted. They are, they are “had” or experienced. Moreover the object as experienced is for such experience true. A vivid dream is for the dreamer indistinguishable from waking experience, the sense-data of which it revives and combines after its own mysterious fashion. All that Shangkarâchârya

78. Mâyāvādam asachchhāstram prachchhannam
bauddham, etc.,

79. Prātibhāsika sattā,

said was that the reality of one state was "contradicted," that is corrected, by another, the dream by the waking state, illusion by normal experience. Was there then any state which was not contradicted or corrected by another? The answer was—Yes, there is—it is that which exists "uncontradicted" in all the "three times" (past, present and future). This is *Parâ Vidyâ*. The working of the senses and intellect are *Aparâ Vidyâ*. These are neither contradicted nor even corrected by *Parâ Vidyâ*. All contradiction is within the *Aparâ Vidyâ* between attributes—the work of the senses and the intellect. But where these have no place and forms have no meaning, where duality does not exist—how can such Reality (itself uncontradicted) contradict? Contradiction is possible when opposite attributes are applied to a thing assumed to be the same. But the same relation does not exist between the two forms of Knowledge. They do not give opposite versions of one and the same Reality. There is and can be nothing in common between

the formal Knowledge of *Aparâ Vidyâ* and the attributeless Immense which is *Parâ Vidyâ*. There is no sameness (in which all contradiction is based) between the qualified and un-qualified, between the formal and formless. Even if it be said that the basis is the same in both, they are indistinguishable. The self never contradicts the evidence of the senses and intellect. All contradiction is relative to these, its instruments but never with it. There are thus no two standards of truth.⁸⁰ The "Real" then is defined as that which is the eternally enduring and changeless, and this is the Supreme. It has been said too by some Western thinkers that conservation and persistence are the criterion of the Real.⁸¹ This is the Hindu view. *Mâyâ*, the Principle of change, itself is not unreal any more

80. See G. R. Malkanis "Method of Philosophy" (Indian Institute of Philosophy, Amalner), 28 *et seq.*

81. As in physics by Professor Tait. And Herbert Spencer on biological principles defined pleasure as the index of the unimpeded flow of vitality. Hence Supreme Bliss is absolutely unimpeded (Akhandâ). Reality = Persistence = Deathlessness (Amritatva) = Bliss (Ânanda).

than it is real. It is an inscrutable Mystery⁸² which is neither. The world is metaphorically described as a dream,⁸³ as a mirage and a falsity. But to whom and when? Not to the world-experiencer to whom it is in fact real whatever his philosophy may be. In a state in which no world is experienced no question of its reality arises. There are in short two conditions, one in which there is world-experience, that is, the gross universe, and another or *Yoga*-experience in which there is either the subtle or ideal universe or no object at all. If we would compare the passing ephemeral world of Humanity with that state which is Divinity, the former has only the reality of its transient stage, whilst the latter is the stageless, timeless, and spaceless Unchangeable, which is alone (in this sense) the Real. To speak

82, Anirvachaniya. All systems ultimately get back to inscrutable Power (Achintya Shakti) "Omnia exeunt in mysterium" as the Schoolmen said.

83. This description is common to many schools in the sense of non-lasting. So in the shlokas by the Sikh Guru Tegh Bahadur he says: "It is a dream. Know nothing is real but Him alone."

(as is commonly done) of an esoteric and exoteric doctrine is to mislead. The doctrine teaches the reality which is conventional or pragmatic and the reality which is the true and transcendental real.⁸⁴ Those who follow it, hold to both realities. The doctrine however is a subtle one, only truly known to its *Sādhakas*.⁸⁵ That it is possible to hold to the reality of the world and yet follow this Monistic doctrine is shown by its *Bhaktas*,⁸⁶ for a *Bhakta* or worshipper must believe in the reality not only of the object of his worship but of himself and his worship and the World in and by which it is done. How to live in this and other antinomies is the secret of men of his temperament, capacity, and type.⁸⁷ It is not uncom-

84. Vyāvahārika sattā, pāramārthika sattā.

85. He who does Sādhana follows the religious discipline which (and not mere intellectual knowledge) qualifies one to be a Vedāntist.

86. He who has Bhakti or devotion to God: a devotee.

87. It is not everyone who is qualified (Adhikārī) for it. Each will follow that school of thought which suits him best. Each has its merits and its demerits, that of Shangkara included, since no intellectual system can truly present the alogical or reconcile the opposites.

monly but wrongly supposed that an adherent of Mâyāvāda Vedānta cannot be a devotee (*Bhakta*). This is not so, as an Indian author well points out⁸⁸ instancing the teaching of the *Shantas* of Mahārāshtra and Jnāneshvara the author of the well-known Commentary on the Gītā, who was both a convinced Mâyāvādin and an ardent partisan of Bhakti. Numberless instances might be cited, as for instance the Shākta Tantras which, though practical Scriptures of worship, teach Vedāntic Monism, or to be more accurate, "non-dualism (advaita = "not two"). What is affirmed is that there is no duality but what else there is is not affirmed. To the Transcendental neither oneness nor any other attribute strictly applies.

Probably it is a correct conclusion to say that Shangkara adjusted his exposition of Vedānta to meet the original Mâyāvāda of the Buddhists and so promulgated a

88. Ghate *Op. cit.* "Remarquons qu'il est d'ailleurs possible de conserver la bhakti sans renoncer à la doctrine de l'unité absolue ni à sa conséquence la doctrine de la Maya." XXVI.

presentment of *Mâyâ* different from that of the Buddhists,⁸⁹ and therefore without abandonment of what he believed to be essential principles of Brahmanism. In fact he was by tradition a worshipper of the Supreme Mother or Shakti whose *Shrî Yantra*⁹⁰ may sometimes be seen in Vedântic Maths.

After all what does the doctrine amount to? The empirical reality of the world is fully affirmed; that is, as long as one is in the world, both mind and its object are equally real. Objects are realities independent of the experiencer. The qualities of things exist in them and are perceived. The limited Knower, in so far as he is limited, is as much of a product as limited Matter is. If our experience tells us that we see a world of objects we in fact do so. Commonsense cannot proclaim otherwise. But the next question is—is it or is it not

89. The term is used by other schools as meaning the inscrutable power of God whereby He is enabled to do that which seems impossible to us.

90. A diagram used in worship. See my "Shakti and Shakta" 2nd Edn, and the *Kamakalavilâsa* Ed. A Avalon.

the fact that there is an experience for which the world does not exist? The answer is in the affirmative, given on the authority of *Shruti*—which the West calls Revelation—but which may be perhaps better described by what is there called Spiritual Experience. This is not for the Hindu *any* spiritual experience but the *standard* experience of the Vedic Seers. That experience may be had by any man who strives for it, not necessarily now in this life but in some stage of his future self-evolution. Is this last experience itself corrected? Those who have it say that it is not. It is a state, permanent, without change, in all the “three times,” past, present and future. If the true Real is (as this system affirms) That which changelessly and for ever endures, then This alone is True Reality and all else *relative* to it is unreality. It seems to be thought that its adherents take the world to be unreal in the epistemological idealistic (one has to take breath with such long words) sense. This is not so. They say in effect “we are in a world which to us *is* real, but we

aspire to the attainment of a state known by our Seers, in which the world of things and pains, the world of contingencies, the world of opposites is not. *Relative* to that, our experience, though in present fact real, is ultimately unreal. The reality of the world is a pragmatic truth."

VI

Speaking in a general way we may convert the second Standard or Sāṅkhya system into the Shākta doctrine of Power or Shakti by substituting for the infinite *Purushas* one Shiva, and for *Prakriti*, Shiva's Power or Shakti, and then affirming that Shiva and Shakti are not, as the Sāṅkhya says, two independent Realities but one Reality in twin aspect, namely, static and kinetic. The Sāṅkhyan Puruṣa is changeless Consciousness (Chit.) So is Shiva. *Prakriti* is as unlimited cause the principle of Change, and as effect limited changing forms, which are, as effects, modifications of their cause. Shakti or Power is that which, in itself unchangeable, produces from out itself as Material Cause the world of change. Common language speaks of the Power of Shiva but strictly Power or Shakti is

Shiva. When the one Reality or Brahman is regarded as the Changeless Consciousness it is called Shiva : when it is regarded as the Power of Consciousness or Consciousness-Power which projects the Universe from out itself, it is called Shakti. It is fundamental doctrine that there is no Shiva without Shakti, nor Shakti without Shiva. But this substantial unity with diversity of aspect involves a changed view of the nature of the cosmic process. In Sāṅkhya there are two Realities, in Shākta doctrine there is only one with dual aspect. According therefore to Sāṅkhya, evolution is from and of *Prakṛiti* who is distinct from the *Purushas* but associated with them. The *Purusha* is the efficient and *Prakṛiti* the material cause, the two causes existing not in one but in two entities. In Shākta doctrine, as Shiva and Shakti are one, it follows that the world is evolved from, and by the one Reality, Shiva-Shakti, that is by a Reality which in one aspect does not change (for Consciousness never does so) and in another aspect is the Cause of Change and

Change itself. As we are here dealing with the Power-aspect of Consciousness to recollect and imagine forth the Universe, we may for convenience speak only of Power or Shakti, if we are careful to remember that Shakti is only the active power of actionless Consciousness (Shiva). The Shākta Darshana reminds us of this fact when it says that the universe is the product of *Chit-Shakti* and *Mâyâ-Shakti*, that is, Chit or Consciousness in its aspect as power and efficient cause and Mâyâ-power or material cause. Chit-Shakti like the Sāṅkhyan Purusha is by its presence the efficient cause and yet the actionless Witness, of all which goes on. What happens is by and in its aspect as Mâyâ-Shakti which, like Prakriti, is the ultimate Substance-Energy out of and through which the universe is evolved. There is thus one ultimate enduring absolute Reality of which all other relative realities as Mind, Life, Matter are transient forms. The world is real and must be so, for we are here viewing the problem from the world standpoint. The question of its rea-

lity only arises when the problem is viewed from the other end.

If we put this doctrine into modern form avoiding all technical terms it comes to this. Persistence is the criterion of Reality. The ultimate Reality is Eternal Being-Consciousness which in itself is changeless. Consciousness whether transcendent or immanent in the world never moves. If in the world-process it appears to do so, this is due to the play of mind of which it is the basis. But this Consciousness is nevertheless a true efficient cause, that is, one which moves without itself being moved. As such it is consciousness-power. But what is the patient and the material cause in the Cosmic Substance? It can be only the one same Reality for there is no other. But what is this Substance-Energy which is the material cause of the universe? The answer depends on the side from which we view it. If we look at it from the other-world aspect, that is, the Reality which we call Power as it is *in Itself*, then the answer is that it

is Consciousness. ⁹¹ If on the other hand we look at it on the world-side then it is the Root-Substance-Energy of the universe which appears as Mind and Matter. That root as cause is neither one nor the other but the Power to produce in itself and to appear as both, when Consciousness on the arising remembrance of past world-enjoyment becomes outer turned (*Bahirmukhî*) and sees, in its gradual awakening to the world, the "This" (*Idam*) or Universe. Why and how? In consciousness there is the seed of power to manifest itself as object to limited centres in it. That seed is the collectivity of all Tendencies (*Sangskâra*) towards life and form acquired in an infinite number of past universes. In short it is the nature of this ultimate Reality to manifest itself. How? Consciousness has two attitudes, inner (*Antarmukhî*) and outward turned (*Bahirmukhî*). In the first and in its fullest sense there is an experience in which there is no subject or object. In the second the object or "This"

91. Chidrapinî Shakti.

(*Idam*) is gradually experienced at first as part of and then outside the Self. There is a polarisation in unitary consciousness of "I" (*Aham*) and "This" (*Idam*), the experiencing subject and his world. The latter is as real as the former which perceives it but since both are transient and change, their reality is relative. Full, timeless, spaceless, endless Persistence is the Absolutely Real which is the Supreme Experience.

I have stated the matter in the simplest way hoping to recur to it in a discussion on the term Shakti or Power. The Advaita Shaiva and Shākta *Shāstras* however explain it in great detail and complication and in technical terms of their own. In what are called Thirty-six *Tattvas* or stages of evolution of Consciousness into Mind and Matter, their Scriptures show the origin of even Purusha and Prakriti. This scheme I have explained elsewhere.⁹² These are not, in such case, the ultimate

92. See my "Shakti and Shakta," 2nd Edn. and "Garland of Letters."

reality but merely one of the principles (*Tattva*) or stages in a line of Consciousness which extends upwards beyond them.⁹³ Purusha and Prakriti *Tattvas* merely mark the stage when the "This" (*Idam*) or object of the "I" (*Aham*) is thrown out of the Self and becomes an outer thing distinct from it. In other words they are the immediate Root of Empirical reality but that Root is itself grounded in the soil of Consciousness which is ultimately *Samvit* or the Supreme Experience Itself.

The relation of this system to that of *Mâyâvâda Vedânta* will be more fully explained in a discussion of what the *Shâkta* understands by *Mâyâ*. Both are Monistic or rather non-dualistic (*Advaitavâda*). The *Sammohana Tantra* thus gives high praise to *Shangkarâchârya* as an incarnation of *Shiva* (*Shangkara*) and describes his four disciples as the four *Mahâpreta*, who support the Throne of the Mother of the

93. Through *Shuddhavidyâ* or *Sadvidyâ*, *Îshvara Sadâ-shiva* or *Sadâkhyâ*, and *Shiva-Shakti-Tattvas*.

World, for such is *Mâyâ-Shakti* to the Shakta. She in one aspect is the ultimate Changeless Reality. She in another aspect does evolve into and appear in the forms of the World. These are in their essence the enduring Real that is Herself, and as forms of Herself the passing yet real objects of experience. There is thus a real yet transient diversity in a real and enduring unity. Doubtless this doctrine does not explain how logically God can be changeless and yet change. But the *Mâyâ* of Shangkarâchârya, which is neither real nor unreal, also runs counter to logic. The highest truth is alogical. Better the Shakta says accept both the reality of the changing World which is imposed by *Mâyâ* on us in our ordinary experience, as also the reality of the Changeless which is experienced in Yoga, a state free of the coercive effect of *Mâyâ*, which is Mahâmâyâ Herself. No logical argument will solve the Problem. In spiritual experience the Problem disappears. And so Shiva says in the Kulârnava Tantra (1-110) "Some desire Dualism

(*Dvaitavâda*), others Monism (*Advaitavâda*). Such however know not My Truth which is beyond both Monism and Dualism (*Dvaitâdvaitavivarjita*).

VII

An examination of all the Indian scriptures of worship leads to the same conclusions. Some are philosophically related to the first division of Vedânta and some to the second in various ways and degrees. The Shâkta Tantras are a form of Advaita Vedânta. All worshippers are practical realists, whatever their doctrine may be. This does not prevent a Shâkta from holding to the doctrine that the Supreme Experience is not an experience by a limited knower of a world of limited objects, external to a plurality of selves, themselves mutually exclusive. He prays to the Mother knowing that the form of the One as Mother is that in which She appears to him.

To sum up:—No Brahmanical system countenances any form of subjectivism. All teach the empirical reality of the world

and the perception of the physical non-mental qualities of things therein. All but one give it, besides this reality, an ultimate reality either as being the combination of several or of two everlasting Realities, or as in some sense a part of the one ultimate Reality or Brahman in its aspect as Power. We have thus Pluralism, Dualism and Monism in all its shades. That one exception says that the universe is ultimately neither real *nor unreal*, nor partly one and partly the other, but an inscrutable mystery which we must accept if we would hold to the changelessness and partlessness of God—which all admit. For only in this way, even though it be formally, is the Reality beyond Reason truly expressed in that high manifestation of Itself which is Reason.

Indian doctrine is realistic firstly in so far as it affirms the independent reality of objects in our daily experience, wherein the percipient is in presence of a reality existing independently of, and distinct from, the *Vritti* or modifications of the Mind. This we have seen. It is secondly realistic

in its treatment of the nature of that perception; thirdly because the sphere of reality is more extensive than that which is generally allowed in the philosophic West, and because experience in time is only a section of what is an eternal process without beginning or end. The first point has been sufficiently established. I will now add some further observations on the second point and deal shortly with the third.

VIII

To deal fully with the nature of perception would take me beyond the scope of this paper. It will be discussed when treating of Shakti or Power as Mind. It is necessary however to make some further reference to it here from the Vedântic standpoint for the doctrines held are more thoroughly realistic than those of many Western schools.

Perception has not only a real object independent of the percipient (thus rejecting the Berkleyan dictum *esse est percipi*), but (as already stated) the physical qualities we perceive are, according to the Indian view, in the object itself. No distinction is made of primary, secondary or tertiary qualities. The first two are in the object as well as in the mind, and the last has an objective basis in the Universal

Mind of which the individual mind is only a special case. A so-called secondary quality is not a mere mental impression in the percipient. It is "out there" in the object perceived. Its ⁹⁴ real, in the sense of basic quality, is quality as the Universal apprehended by the Universal and Collective Mind. Its quality as a variable sense-particular is perceived by the individual mind according to its manner of perceiving. This quality is therefore "there" in the object even when there is no individual mind perceiving it. For this Universal is always "sensed" by the Collective or Cosmic Mind. It has not however all the qualities which different percipients see in it from different points of view and at the same time. For, in this sense, individual sensation is "private." Indian thought does not hold that the object as perceived is an exact copy of the object as it is in itself. Though the object is always one and the same, all do not per-

(94) I here answer, from the Vedāntic standpoint, some queries put in R. F. A. Hoernle's "Studies in Contemporary Metaphysics," 104 where the question is discussed.

ceive it in one and the same way. Both mind and its object are active in perception and affect the one the other. The mind brings its own quota to the act of experience. What is this? These are the individual *Sangskâras* or tendencies and aptitudes produced by former experience in this and previous lives. As the product of such previous lives they are innate. The variety of sensation is thus due to the imported subjective element or individual *Sangskâra* and not attributable to the object. It is the percipient's manner of perceiving it. The Universals of *Tanmâtra*, the Generals of what is apprehended as the-sense particulars, are always objectively present. Hence sensation is both "private" through the individual mind and common through the Cosmic Mind. The Hindus therefore are more realistic than those who distinguish between the qualities as primary and so forth and make sensation merely "private."

The basis of these principles may be found in the doctrine that the quality of the object which is sensed and the consti-

tution of the sense which perceives it are the same.

The same forces which go to make the subtle mental object also go to make the sense which perceives it. The gross material object is derived from a combination of the subtle elements. One and the same Causal Stress in the original Substance-Energy (Shakti) phenomenally appears as the sense on the one hand and the matter and its qualities on the other. The knowing is of like by like. The causal aspect of an Universal is a stress or motion (Spanda) in Universal Substance without reference to any percipient organ at all. From the phenomenal aspect the Universal relates to a percipient organ evolved co-ordinately with it which may be either absolute or relative, universal or individual. The object is apprehended as it is with all its qualities, subject to the particular *Sangskâras* or mental tendencies which merely affect the manner of knowing them. Western science thinks that it is concerned with a real world which persists independently of our experience but then,

as has been pointed out,⁹⁵ we are committed to a division between the contents of immediate experience and its causes which division has become deeper and more impassable with every advance in physics and physiology. For the physical causes of perception are now inferred but not perceived. The real material world has been driven into the unseen and now lies (it is said) hidden behind the screen of its own effects. Perception becomes a remote psychological effect of a long train of causes, physical and physiological, originally set in motion by the external thing but in no way resembling it. It dissolves the thing perceived into a remote reality which is neither perceived nor perceivable: as in the case of the reduction of matter to the structure and motions of invisible homogeneous electric units. Thus we perceive for example in an object impenetrability, density, weight, configuration, colour, taste and so forth whereas we are told that the object is really constituted of

(95) Balfour. Gifford Lectures (1914,) 159.

vortices in homogeneous ether which is not matter at all. It turns the world of common sense into an illusion and on this illusion it rests its case.⁹⁶

According to the Indian view we *do* perceive things as they phenomenally are. The physical causes of perception are perceived. What is not perceived and is not the object of any percipient is the creative activity of and in the fundamental Substance-Energy which is phenomenally presented to us as mind and senses on the one hand and objects on the other.

As sensible experiences do undoubtedly exist, so there must be, other than and outside of ourselves as individual experiencers, things by which such experiences are produced. It is not the fact that what really exists are only our impressions and ideas. The sensible world exists apart from, and other than, our experience. The *Shâstra* puts forward many reasons in support of these common sense beliefs.⁹⁷

(96) Balfour. Gifford Lectures (1914,) 159.

(97) See "Hindu Realism," 21 *et seq.*

Thus we deny the existence of things perceived in dreams precisely because we are certain of the existence of things experienced on waking. If the sensible did not exist then dreams, which are the repetition of things already experienced when waking as existing outside, would be impossible. If sensible things had no existence of their own there is no reason why we should not see them at will and continuously just as we can have our own ideas at will and for so long as we like. But on the contrary we perceive sensible things only so long as they remain in relation with us and this is because they exist independently of us. So again we distinguish between right perceptions and hallucinations, which we could not do if sensible things had no objective existence: all of which arguments are grounded on good realistic common sense with nothing "dreamy" about them.

These teachings are not merely confined to the Standard itself but are parts of the other Standards also, subject to the necessary modifications involved in the fact that

advance is made to a new Standard. It is obvious that the teachings of all the Standards are not in all respects the same, otherwise there would not be several Standards. Nevertheless there are teachings which are common, correspondences, and similarities. The second Standard takes up the matter (whatever it be) at the point at which it was left by the previous Standard and carries it further. Thus both the first and second Standard treat Consciousness as distinct from Mind, but the first regards it as a property of the Self and the second as the Self's essential characteristic. The first Standard does not recognise the faculties of Mind which the second Standard calls 'Judgment'⁹⁸ and 'Self-arrogation,'⁹⁹ as substantive principles at all. It would regard them as attributes,¹⁰⁰ of the Self. Mind as Manas is in the first Standard a substantive principle but it is atomic ¹⁰¹, that is without magni-

(98) Buddhi.

(99) Ahangkâra.

(100) Guna.

(101) Anu ; in Vedânta Anu is created and therefore cannot be partless,

tude. It is so to say a point at which, and through which, connection is established between the Self and objects for the purposes of experience. Hence all experience is necessarily serial. It is like a tap through which all experience whether internal or external must flow. The functions of Manas are generally recognised as the same. But the whole "Inner Instrument"¹⁰² as assumed by Sāṅkhya and Vedānta will better explain life by their respective activities than the simple atomic *Manas* of the first Standard. Just as the senses are of the same nature as the *Paramānus* or originators of the qualities which are perceived by means of them, so in Sāṅkhya and Vedānta the senses and their subtle objects¹⁰³ have a common origin. These minima of sensible matter are in the first Standard non-mental, in the others they are the universals or generals of the sense-particulars which by the

(102) Antahkarana involving Buddhi, Ahankāra, Manas.

(103) 'Tanmātra' which in Sāṅkhya derive with senses from Ahankāra and in Vedānta the senses and their gross objects both derive from the Āpanchīkṛita Tanmātra.

addition of mass appear as such particulars in the form of gross matter. In a general way there are similarities especially in fundamental matters as regards the theory of Perception, such as the reality of the object with its own physical qualities and the like. On the other hand principles peculiar to the system have their modifying effect. Thus in the Advaita Vedānta Consciousness is the one Immanent Reality, and it is the discovery of the essential identity between Mind and its material object which makes the substance of perception according to Vedānta. The main realistic position is maintained throughout the standards for all empirical experience.

IX

As regards the third point it is to be noted that there are many more Realities than those experienced by the gross mind. The Real as object is not merely the material as that term is ordinarily understood. There is the world of the Subtle Real which is the object of the mind which has developed to that stage in which it can be experienced. The ¹⁰⁴ originating sources of the sensible are themselves super-sensible realities. These constitute, besides the sensible, other worlds which are super-sensible. A world or sphere of existence is nothing but a condition of the experience on the part of experiencing Beings: and therefore there must be as many varieties of worlds as there are fundamentally different types of beings. In the sensible world are a great variety

(104) See "Hindu Realism," 101.

of beings who form a number of orders and grades. These grades form a series, at one extremity of which lies that order of beings whose experiences are the most limited. From this grade upwards to man there is an ascending series, each successive order of which has experiences wider in range than those of the beings of the preceding order. Man stands at the head of this series. But there is no reason to suppose that he is the absolutely highest order. In fact he is limited and helped by Unseen Powers, Beings more powerful than he who exist in unseen forms. If what is supersensible in man can exist in an unseen form after death, why not other Beings who habitually exist in such forms? And if these Beings exist in unseen or supersensible forms, then there are also states of existence or worlds which are also supersensible and quite as real, if not in a sense more so than the gross world of ordinary experience.¹⁰⁵ Experience reaches up to that of the Cosmic Mind which apprehends

(105) See "Hindu Realism," 101, 102.

the world of universals as they exist in themselves.¹⁰⁶ The *Sangsâra*, or wandering or world of birth and death, is thus constituted of different orders of experiencing beings, of which man is one, and there are worlds of experience beyond the *Sangsâra* from which there is no return for the Beings therein. These supersensible worlds¹⁰⁷ are as real as the material and as much the body of and in correspondence with the Metaphysical Real as is the latter.¹⁰⁸

(106) This is not the Supreme but the Hiranyagarbha Consciousness for which experience the Universals are still mysterious stresses in Consciousness, the real nature of which is only known to the Lord Himself (Īshvara).

(107) Each of these has its inhabitants or Experiencers. The Lokas or Worlds of experience are fourteen, seven above and seven below ; super-normal, normal and sub-normal. Thus also the Shaiva systems speak of various classes of beings (Jîvas) such as Mantras, Maheshvaras Mantreshvaras, Vidyeshvaras and so forth, who exist in the descending and ascending stages of involution and evolution which are called the 36 Tattvas.

(108) H. Keyserling dealing with the Indian outlook in his *Das Reisetagebuch eines Philosophen*, 3rd Ed, says at p. 86 : Ich weiss dass das Psychische ein ebenso objectives ist wie das materielle, dass Vorstellungen ein genau so entsprechender leib von metaphysisch-wirklichem sein Konnen wie feste Korper, dass es uberall moglich ist im Prinzip von Geiste her den stoff zu beeinflussen.

The stages here are *lived* through as states in each of which nearer approach is (through the transformation of the experiencer and with him his world) made to That (*Tat*) which is the full and perfect Real, which stages at length pass and expand into It as that Whole or *Pârna* in which all forms of determined experience are had, which sums them all up in Itself and which transcends them all. The stages may be thought of and in some degree described, but are in themselves the actual experience lived through of determined being evolving into the *Pârna*, the Full or Whole. The stage is not a matter of subjective information but is objectively lived. It is not a mere matter of argument but is a transformed life. The Self gives testimony of Itself in various ways to the Self in the process or movement of the Self to the Self. That testimony again is not something communicated from one to another. It is a realisation of the self as the Self in each of its grades of manifestation. "To know is to be"; a Vedântic maxim which has application not only as a

description of the highest end but to every stage on the way thither.

X

Here we touch upon the practical bent of the Indian mind and its craving for reality which makes it satisfied with nothing but the most real foundation for its knowledge. To truly know is *to be*. I do not intend to work out the matter now as it forms a distinct subject with which I hope to deal on some future occasion. It is this :—the teachings of Religion which Philosophy supports are not mere speculation. The knowledge of plurality is based on actual experience, that is, of the senses and reasoning thereon. If the reality and nature of the world requires to be established it is done here. But what of supersensible matters ?¹⁰⁹ Their nature and existence is not the subject of mere speculative reasoning which can at best establish a conclusion of probability only.

(109) Atindriya.

Reasoning on such matters gives no certitude that we perceive the Real and the True. The warrant of authority again is actual experience (*Anubhava*) which is not a specific form of proof co-ordinate with other forms but the basis of all these—the Self itself¹¹⁰ of a supra-sensible kind. Just as the physical sense-faculties are extended by the use of scientific instruments, so by *Yoga* there is an extension of natural faculties which gives experience on a plane beyond that of the ordinary daily earth experience. This *Yoga*-experience is of varying degrees leading up to *Īshvara*-experience or that of the Lord Himself who is the Great Yogī. If then the Vedānta affirms that notwithstanding apparent plurality all is one—"All this universe is Brahman"—it is not merely because argument leads to a Monistic conclusion (it may perhaps as well lead to the contrary), but because that unity has actually and

(110) See G. R. Malkani "Method of Philosophy" criticising Professor Zimmerman's article, "Truth and its criterion in Shangkaracharya's Vedānta" in Indian Philosophical Review.

really been experienced directly by those who affirm it. The truth of the doctrine is accepted by others on the faith of this experience which they accept. This is the twofold sense of Veda.

Two points are apt to be overlooked nowadays owing to Western influence. The first is that the Vedânta is not a mere system of philosophy in the modern Western sense. It is based on Revelation (*Shruti*). If not so based, it is worth no more and may be worth less than any other particular philosophy, seeing that it, in some respects, at any rate in its Monistic form, runs counter to our sense-experience. The second point is that it is not to be understood by mere reading and study. He who would understand it must first worship and self-discipline himself by the Vedântic *Sâdhanâ*. The notion that a man if clever enough can understand anything is not an Indian one. His must be not only a good mind but a pure and good character. Such an one alone will act rightly and will understand the Real. Understanding it, he will worship the Ground in its form. The

Hindu may be right or wrong but he is obviously a greater "realist" when he holds that matter is not only an independent reality, but it is perceived as it is with its qualities, than even the modern scientist who makes matter as presented an illusory appearance produced by some reality no doubt, but one which is wholly different from what we perceive. To the former present experience is real but still more so is the persistent Ground of it, attainable by a practical and real transformation of the Self. From whatever point of view we examine the matter we find a realistic standpoint. One is at a loss to know how the notion that the Hindus were non-realists arose. For however Mâyāvāda may be ill-understood it is no case a philosophic system adopted by all India. Perhaps some may have confused the questions whether the world is real, and whether in action due regard is had to the realities or circumstances under which it is to be taken. A man who in his actions does not take sufficient account of the real facts of the world is sometimes said to

have no sense of reality. This may doubtless in some cases be mere foolishness. In others when noble ends are pursued in disregard of the sordid "realisms" of the day, the world is the better for it. However this be, I merely note the possible ambiguity and do not further discuss a question which has no bearing on my present subject.

Whatever be Indian capacity in ordinary affairs, the Indian mind has done its thinking with a practical end in view. Philosophy was not pursued from a mere curious desire to know, to found "systems," earn academic applause, and so forth but with a view to realise the practical end of all material being or Happiness. Every system posits that as its aim. The world and material ends are real, but spiritual experience is the truly Real. Philosophy worked hand in hand with religion as in Europe during the Middle Ages, though it was never *Meretrix Theologorum*. The Vedānta is really an Indian Scholasticism based on *Shruti*, or what Westerns call Revelation, though we must not confound the two.

There is in fact scarcely any important technical term of Western philosophy or religion which can be used without some qualification. Rather we should say Philosophy and Religion were not severed, the fundamental principle of Vedānta being to sever absolutely nothing. All knowledge was considered in relation to the whole. The notion held by some in the West that Religion and Science and philosophy are antagonistic was unknown; such notion having arisen in the West for historical reasons, Religion there being identified with Christian Dogma. Indian Religion teaches that Absolute Bliss is to found only in That which is beyond the contingent world of opposites which is unimpeded and full Being. It not only so teaches but gives out the practical means or *Sādhana* whereby this state of Bliss may be attained which is the true and real.

The only fruitful path is that of real striving, or *Sādhana*. Any *Sādhana* sincerely and diligently pursued will secure its fruit. The fruit of the highest *Shākta Sādhana* (for *Sādhana* may be of various kinds) is

the realisation of its fundamental *Shruti*, "All this is verily Brahman" (*Sarvam Khalvidam Brahma*). "This" is the Universe. Brahman the Immense or Immeasurable is as Power (*Mahāshakti*) its cause.

That Power is real and so is the universe which is for the worshipper Its Body or Form.¹¹¹

For if the material cause is real so is the effect. He affirms "I am real as Body" for Matter is a form of the Great Power or Shakti. "I am real as Mind;" for mind is another form of the same Power. *Sa'ham* "She I am" refers to the Mother of the universe. Again "I am the Real as Unchanging Consciousness vehicled by Mind and Body and transcending it." The forms come and go re-entering and again re-issuing from the *Paramārtha* or Supreme

(111) A correspondent has asked me how this view differs from Vishishtādvaita Vedānta. It differs in this that according to Rāmānuja, mind and matter not merely seem to be but are the body of the Lord distinct from Him; whilst in Shākta doctrine, the world is the body of the Lord so long as it lasts, but ultimately there is only the one Ātmā in which mind and matter are merged.

Reality. *So'ham* "He I am", *Shivo' ham* "Shiva I am" the Shâkta also says, when speaking of the *Kutastha* Shiva or Enduring Real. Those who thus worship Power become "Power."

Though the unreality of the universe is spoken of because of its being a passing thing, it is yet to be also remembered that the world-process is according to Indian ideas an eternal one. The world is not something which appears and is gone for ever. It reappears eternally. It is not the first and only one produced, but merely one of a beginningless and endless series.¹¹² The manifestation of the universe is thus an eternal process. It appears and disappears. This is the pulsing movement as the systole and diastole of the Cosmic Heart as Divine Power. Nothing can come from nothing, and something cannot vanish into nothing. It arises from the seed of Tendency (*Sangskâra*) which is in the Great Womb (*Mahâyoni*) and is there in a potential state. The seed sprouts as the great *Ashvattha*

(112) For the argument on this point, common to all the three Standards, see "Hindu Realism," 95.

Tree which is the manifested universe. It dies down again into the seed of potentiality to reappear again in endless succession. This appearance and reappearance is the *Sangsâra* or the constant "moving on" or wandering in the worlds of birth and death.¹¹³ There is thus an eternal series of Experiencers.

Man breathes forth and inbreathes. What is done "here" (*Iha*) is done "there" (*Amutra*). The Universe pulses forth and rests, and pulses back again. Breathing is a microcosmic re-presentation of the macro-cosmic process.¹¹⁴ And so the duration of the life of the highest being in the hierarchy of Being or Brahîa, for whose

(113) Called in the West re-incarnation. Transcendentally there is no *re*-incarnation. Empirically also *re*-incarnation is not an exact term. In say a series of three, viz., X—Y—Z, the first X does not *re*-incarnate as X but as Y nor Y as Y but as Z. The forms change but there is yet a continuity which is the cause of Z affirming that *he* was Y and before that X and so on. The Âtman being eternal has no real birth or death. It is merely related to and dissociated from a body.

(114) As to the charge of Anthropomorphism which with Animism stampedes so many I will deal in another place. In Prânayâma or Breath-control, appearance, stay, and disappearance are Kumbhaka, Rechaka, Puraka,

experience the universe as a whole exists, is the duration of that particular Universe. The duration of Brahmâ's life is that of one outgoing breath¹¹⁵ of Kâla¹¹⁶ which is objectively a beat of Cosmic Time. Time is no magnitude for the Supreme. For Him the Immeasurable there is no measurer. But Time is attributed to His appearances. The Universe is dissolved and at rest for a period of the same duration when it appears again with, what the Pancharâtra Tantra calls, the "Wheel of Dawn."

Ancient Hindu teaching is thus to be found in the following words of Professor Huxley:—¹¹⁷ "The faith which is born of knowledge finds its object in an eternal order bringing forth ceaseless change, through endless time, in endless space: the manifestations of Cosmic Energy alternating between phases of potentiality and spheres of explication. It may be as

(115) Nishvâsa.

(116) Kâla, here the Time-aspect of the Supreme. Tîen follows the Great Dissolution (Mahâpralaya). See Introduction to Prapanchasâra Tantra 8. Tantrik Texts Vol. 3, Ed. A. Avalon and Schrader *Op. cit.* 27

(117) Evolution and Ethics, pp, 8, 9.

Kant suggests, every cosmic Magma predestined to evolve into a new world has been the no less pre-destined end of a vanished predecessor." For Cosmic Energy we may read Divine Power or *Daivî Shakti* : for phase of potentiality *Pralaya*, when the world exists potentially in the Womb of the Immense : ¹¹⁸ and for sphere of explication, *Srishti* or production, therefrom.¹¹⁹ The Power, the Process and the Result are real. Shangkarâchâryya from his transcendental view point calls the world "false," but to the Shâkta, and from his standpoint, it is real. It is the field of action and liberation "*Mokshâyate sang-sâra*." "The world is made the seat of liberation as the Kulârnavâ Tantra says—To him Mâyâ is not unreal (*Avastu*). It is not a mere mist of ignorance connected, yet unconnected, with the Brahman and

(118) Brahman.

(119) In the same way Herbert Spencer speaks of the alternating states of homogeneity (that is *Pralaya* when all is undifferentiated mass) Heterogeneity (that is *Srishti* when the generals and their particulars are produced) a state of relative stability (*Sthiti*) and then a lapse into homogeneity again (*Pralaya*).

which screens the Real. It is an eternal Reality or Power appearing as the passing and changing worlds. For it is the World-Mother who is the Great Power Herself. What is unreal (in the sense of passing) are the Names and Forms which are yet, so long as they last as the objects of perception, also real. And so the Shākta can say of himself that not only in Spirit, but in Mind and Body, *Sa' ham*, "She I am," "I am the Real and the Power of the Real."

WORKS BY ARTHUR AVALON ON TANTRA SHASTRA

RS. A.

Tantra of the Great Liberation. (*Mahā-nirvāṇa Tantra*). A Translation from the Sanskrit, with Introduction and Commentary by Arthur Avalon *Reprinting* ... 8 0

Hymns to the Goddess. From the Tantra and other Shāstra and the Stotra of Shangkarāchāryya. With Introduction and Commentary. Translated from the Sanskrit by Arthur and Ellen Avalon ... 3 0

Principles of Tantra. Part I. The Tantratattva of Shrīyukta Shiva Chandra Vidyānava Bhattachāryya Mahodaya. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary by Arthur Avalon ... 8 0

Do do Part II. With an Introduction by Shrīyukta Barada Kānta Majumdar. Edited by Arthur Avalon ... 12 0

"Wave of Bliss" (*Anandalahari*) a translation and Commentary by Arthur Avalon ... 1 8

"Greatness of Shiva" (*Mahimnastava of Pushpadānta*) a translation and commentary by Arthur Avalon together with Sanskrit commentary of Jagannātha Chakravartti ... 1 8

BY SIR JOHN WOODROFFE

Shakti and Shakta. Essays and addresses on the Shakta Tantra Shastra *Second Edition* 7 8

The Serpent Power. (*Kundalini Yoga*) ... 15 12

Garland of Letters. *Reprinting.*

TANTRIK TEXTS

UNDER GENERAL EDITORSHIP OF
ARTHUR AVALON

RS. A.

Vol. I. Tantrabhidhana with *Bija-Nighantu* and *Mudrā-Nighantu*.—A Tantrik Dictionary, Edited by Tāranātha Vidyāratna with an Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon... 2 0

Vol. II. Shatchakranirupana.—A work on the six centres of the body by Pārṇānanda Svāmī, with Commentary of Shangkara. *Pādukāpanchaka*—("Five-fold footstool of the Guru"), with commentary of Kālīcharana and Notes from the Tīkā of Vishvanātha on the Second Patala of Kāvāya Kālīkā Tantra; with an Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon ... 2 0

Vol. III. Prapanchasara Tantra.—Edited by Tāranātha Vidyāratna, with an Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon ... 3 0

Vol. IV. Kulachudamani Nigama.—Edited by Girisha Chandra Vedāntatīrtha. With an Introduction by Akshaya Kumāra Maitra ... 2 0

Vol. V. Kulārṇava Tantra.—Edited by Tāranātha Vidyāratna, with Introduction in English by Arthur Avalon. ... 3 0

RS. A.

Vol. VI. Kalivilasa Tantra.—Edited by
Pârvati Charana Tarkatîrtha with English
Introduction by Arthur Avalon ... 2 0

Vol. VII. Shrichakrasambhara.—A Bud-
dhist Tantra, edited by Kazi Dausamdup
with a foreword on the Vajrayâna by Arthur
Avalon

Vol. VIII. First Part. Tantraraja (Kâdimata)
Edited by Mahâmahopâdhyâya Lakshmana
Shâstri Drâvida 3 0

In the Press

Vol. IX. The Second Part of same is in
preparation

Vol. X. Kamakalavilasa, a Tantrik
Prakarana of the Kashmir School by Punyâ-
nanda with Commentary by Anantanâtha.

**Vol. XI. Advaitabhavopanishad, Kalyu-
panishad, Taropanishad, Kaulopanishad.**
With Introduction by Arthur Avalon ...

To be had of

LUZAC & CO., LONDON. THACKER SPINK & CO.,
CALCUTTA. GANESH & CO., MADRAS.
TARAPOREWALA & SONS, BOMBAY.

SOME PRESS NOTICES

" These Books dealing with the secret Mysticism and Magic of India are the most interesting which have been published in recent years."—*Neue Metaphysische Rundschau*.

" His book (Mahanirvana) brilliantly inaugurates the study of the Tantras, the literature of which occupies a front rank in the religious life of Modern India. The introduction to it is the most solid and exact account that has yet been written on the doctrines of the Tantras, their ontology, mystical phraseology, worship, yoga and ethics."—*Revue Critique* (Professor Sylvain Levi).

" The translation (Mahanirvana) is distinguished by its elegance and by the profound and comprehensive knowledge by which it is backed " (and by another critic in the same journal) " Shakti and Shakta reveals a wonderful grasp of the fundamentals of consciousness."—*The Theosophist* (Dr. Schrader).

" He commenced his work with a Hindus' heart, with a Hindus' regard, and a Hindus' faith and so his translation is what it ought to be. The Introduction not only reveals the learning of its author but is also proof that he has

understood in what light Hindus regard the Tantra Shastra."—(*Hitabadi*).

"In perusing the author's Introduction to the Mahanirvana Tantra we have been bewildered with astonishment. We could never have dreamt that it was possible for a Modern Christian Englishman to so fully understand such matters as the Mode of Tantrik Sadhana. The author has certainly learnt a great deal of the inner and secret doctrine of the Tantra. We have never heard even from any Bengali Pandit such a clear exposition of Mantra Shakti as the author has given. It seems as if the World-Mother has again willed it and has again desired to manifest Her power".—*Sahitya*.

"The first really important work that I know of on the Spirit of any Ritual-philosophy."—*Hermann Keyserling* (*Das Reise Tagebuch Einer Philosophen*.)

"A magnificent historical and philological record due to the author who has taken upon himself with complete success a task which might seem to be thankless but which is in reality fecund, opening for the first time an enormous and almost unknown branch of Indian literature,"—*Isis* (*M. Masson D'Oursel*)

"Mr. Avalon is doing a very great service for students of religions by making a small part of it (Tantra-Shastra) accessible. The Treatise (Principles of Tantra) is the most remarkable presentment on the subject which has yet appeared. It is full of points of very great interest."—*The Quest* (*W. Mead*).

"Is clearly an European disciple of some Pandit belonging to the left-hand Shaktas and he shows great sympathy for the sect. He is always ready to defend any of its doctrines and practices even the most shameful. On the other hand his faithful discipleship has brought him a wonderful understanding of the teaching and cult of the sect . . . of great exegetical value."—*International Review of Missions* (Dr. J. N. Farquahar).

"For the student of religions there is then a mine opened for his enquiries. The whole work bears the stamp of conscientiousness and accuracy.—*Literarishches Zentralblatt fur Deutschland*.

"The first impression was of amazement and delight. The Mahanirvana is one of the most important of Hindu philosophical works combined with elaborate ritualism and its translation therefore by an European involved certainly a prodigious amount of study, sympathy and real understanding. Of the Introduction alone it may be said that for its lucidity, conciseness, directness and for its depth of penetration and insight it may itself claim to be a standard work on the much abused Tantras. We have rarely come across such an illuminating exposition of the Principles of Devi Worship."—(*Prabuddha Bharata*).

"Most meritorious productions. From what has been said it is clear that Avalon is right when he declares that up to now this literature has been too often judged and more often condemned without knowing it and that the

Tantras deserve to become better known than has been the case hitherto."—*Ostasiatische Zeitschrift* (Professor M. Winternitz).

"Arthur Avalon has rendered an eminent service to the Cause of Sanskrit Literature."—*Calcutta Review* (Mahamahopadhyaya Satish Chandra Vidyabhushana)

"We suspect that Arthur Avalon is one of the learned Pandits of Bengal whose native speech has not been without influence upon his almost impeccable English. We value highly the work done, if for no other reason than it gives us a real insight into the jargon of the ritual and the worthlessness of Tantrik Philosophy."—*The Nation* (New York).

"Illuminating discussion ("Serpent Power"), Author makes some rarely fine brilliant definitions...throughout maintains a strictly scientific attitude, though he is obviously impressed with the extraordinary nature of the Tantrik Doctrine."—*Britain and India*.

"There is no doubt that he has an extensive and peculiar knowledge of the subject of which he treats."—

Luzacs Oriental List (Dr. Barnett.)

"The first fact which strikes the student of Eastern Philosophy is the Author's extraordinary knowledge and the second is his impartiality."—(*Shakti and Shakta*).
New India.

BOOKS BY SIR JOHN WOODROFFE

BHARATA SHAKTI

3rd Edition (Addresses on
Indian culture)

... Rs. 1 8 0

IS INDIA CIVILIZED ?

2nd Edition

... Rs. 2 8 0

SEED OF RACE

... Re. 1 0 0

SHAKTI AND SHAKTA

2nd Edition

(Essays and Addresses in
the Tantra Shastra)

... Rs. 7 8 0

THE GARLAND OF LETTERS

(Studies in the Mantra Shastra)
nearly ready

THE WORLD AS POWER (Life)

In the Press

IS INDIA CIVILIZED ?

PRESS OPINIONS

Foreign domination has been much more than mainly political. It is the cultural and social conquest of India which is the really important one, insidious in its cause but permanent in its results. Alien culture threatens to obscure the soul of India, to swamp the Indian culture. Therefore Sir John Woodroffe's latest book is most opportune. His style is simple and convincing. The fundamental principles of Indian culture are examined with great power of insight. Sir John's purpose is to defend the minds of young India against defilement—to create a strong working faith in their own ideals and for this India will be very grateful."—*The Commonwealth* (M.S.M.).

"Powerful exposition of Indian culture.....Many wise political, social and religious observations abound in its inspiring pages. We can commend its perusal to all who are seekers after the truth. If it serves to induce the Europeans to abate some of their racial pride, prejudice and intolerance, and the Indians to have a more correct appreciation of their culture, then it must be regarded as a

most opportune publication at the present moment when the great catastrophe in the West has shaken the faith in the basic principles of Western culture and has given a powerful stimulus to the spirit of introspection and enquiry."—*The Leader*.

"Deep insight into what is of true value in Indian culture—clear with an enthusiasm all the more effective because restrained. It is his conception of India that is the great inspiration in the book. His conception of life is Indian through and through. I have read this book all one afternoon marking page after page its trenchant criticisms of our detractors, its pen pictures of Indian life and culture and especially its illuminating description of what some of our philosophies really mean. It is as if once again as of old, one heard an ancient Guru talking to his disciples. It is a noble book for every Indian home."—*New India* (C. Jinarajadasa).

"Sir John has already earned an abiding place in the affections of our countrymen by his intimate and profound studies of Hinduism and his enthusiastic exposition of the basis of Hindu culture. The volume in spite of the ephemeral nature of the incidents of composition has a permanent value and must find a place in the library of every self-respecting Indian."—*Central Hindu College Magazine, the monthly organ of Benares Hindu University*.

"This matter and much more are explained with wonderful lucidity. Sir John points out that the true view of human evolution is the Eastern one

and supports and illustrates his position by reference to, and also using the clearcut and meaningful nomenclature of that system of Hindu Philosophy and Religion of which he is such a master."—*The Hindu* (Dr. Subramanya Aiyar).

"So ably indicates the basic principles of Indian civilization and repudiates the baseless charges with such commendable enthusiasm and righteous indignation as could have befitted one who by birth has inherited the culture—deserves study by every sincere believer in Indian thought. An admirable book—crushing reply—from start to finish shows that the author has a masterly and sympathetic grasp of the whole situation and he who goes through it will find himself in touch with the essentials of Indian civilization."—*Prabuddha Bharata*.

"Sir John Woodroffe has done well to expose the fallacies underlying certain old time attacks recently reiterated—is deeply imbued with the spirit of Shakta Vedantism, and it is from this point of view that he defends Indian civilization. In a very fine chapter Sir John Woodroffe exhibits the various opinions held about India and her civilization."

—*Servant of India* (Professor R. D. Ranade)

"Contains high intellectual qualities with freedom from prejudice or nonsense of any kind—the best informed work on the subject written by one not a Hindu."—*United India and Native States*.

"The book demands the close attention of every

Indian who is interested in the future of his country. It is an urgent invitation to us to appreciate better both this sacred trust and the near peril which besets it, and to stand firm and faithful in the hour of ordeal. The author develops his theory with great skill and much quiet depth and the essays are strewn throughout with acute and penetrating observations expressed with a lucid solidity which tempts one constantly to quotation."

—*Arya*.

"Is throughout thought-provoking and replete with interesting passages. But those on whom Sir John's eulogisms will drop like manna from Heaven should also ponder on what (else) he has to say. It would be well for India if instead of cultivating a blind racial vanity, for which Sir John's book will furnish ample material to the unthinking bigot, we concentrate our attention on those other lessons preached by him, for only by so doing we would make a right use of the truths it contains."

—*Modern Review*.

"This noble work is a trumpet call to the Indians to realise their greatness and distinctiveness and to build the great future of India—a loving and intimate student of a great culture."—*Hindu Message*.

"India owes a deep debt of gratitude to Sir John Woodroffe for this timely volume in defence of Indian culture—certain social aspects have been so satisfactorily discussed and defended by this erudite defender of our civilization that if the Indian social

reformer would care to read and think over them, much of his rancour towards orthodoxy will prove baseless. India's greatest civilization is misunderstood by many intellectual imps both foreign and indigenous. It is a consolation to find that great minds, Indian or foreign, can realise it so well as in the case of Sir John's. Knowledge of the inner capability of the Ego teaches but one kind of patriotism which is of course universal and not national. It is as silly to hug the degenerates of our own nationality as to hate the great souls of the other continents. But to stand for their rights when oppressed is the privilege of every right thinking man and words fail us in thanking Sir John for his humane duty ; may they be ever more."—*Mahratta*.

" Sir John writes profoundly of the Hindu religion and culture of which he is an ardent admirer and his defence of Indian civilization is informed with a glowing enthusiasm. He finds it easy to confound the rationalist Mr. Archer. The book will not please every Christian that reads it. But no occidental student of Indian politics should miss the reading, for it explains much in the Hindu character and point of view that before was obscure and incomprehensible. The Author believes that the ancient Hindu culture which has persisted throughout the ages, is the best for India and he is fearful lest it be lost in the political maelstrom which will follow the war."—*Capital*.

Great erudition—sturdy champion of Sanâtana Dharma.—*Indian Daily News*.

“Most effective and crushing rejoinder—the work of a distinguished scholar and deep thinker—truly merits a very wide circulation in this country. It is a profoundly philosophic study of the subject.”—*Hindusthan Review*.

“The constitution of a politically dependent people can never appear to advantage because it is the interest of the politically dominant people to discredit everything belonging to the subject race as inferior. The Author has been actuated by a strict regard for truth and a desire for the establishment of true Dharma. He has not spared from criticism what is mean, calculating, vulgar, inhuman in his own countrymen, nor has he minced words in condemning what is low or servile or selfish or imitative in Indians of to-day. Actuated by the highest aims, he has really given a most remarkable and convincing book on a difficult and much-abused theme.”—*Bombay Chronicle*.

“Ablly written defence of Hindu civilization by a profound scholar.....It would have been better if he had entered as much an emphatic protest against the prevailing abuses of Hindu society as he has taken care to define its virtues and ideals.”—*Everyman's Review*.

“It is rather unusual to find among the British members of the Indian Judiciary an apologist for the claims of the Neo-Hindu revivalists and their

allies the Extreme Nationalists. It is in this role that we find Sir John Woodroffe figuring as a sort of modern Saul among the prophets—much of the book is occupied with an unworthy attack on Western and particularly Christian civilization.”—*Madras Mail*.

“ From keen irritation and annoyance.....we passed to a feeling of contempt touched by a sorry sense of amusement that the Absolute (or the Spirit or whatever else the Author wishes to call it) should indulge in the bad joke of this conflict... We consider both Mr. Archer and Sir John Woodroffe in this episode a nuisance... There is an absence of clearness even of logic... A person who presents such a position as this is not really and truly the friend of India.”—*The Indian Philosophical Review* (Professor A. Widgery).

“ Rechauffe’ of more or less familiar arguments—without the illumination of any new thought—vague, obscure—illogical antithesis and loose and disingenuous assertions— Extravagant abstraction—cannot be exempted from the charge of bias. His interpretation of the West suggests that with all his metaphysical abstractions he is unable to distinguish form from reality— Vapourising, nebulous. The aspect of these essays is when not obscure, familiar ; their style is provocative without being very stimulating. The confusion of issues, the multiplication of sketchy extracts without context, the breach of simple rules of logic and a running speech

that gives no reason for the division into Chapters make altogether a book which is very hard to read and still harder to remember when read."

—*Englishman*.

"Sir John Woodroffe is a guide whom the reader may follow with confidence. He has lived many years in India and has shown himself to be in real sympathy with the spirit of the East ; on the other hand he has not lost touch with the ideals of his own people, nor been blinded by the essential beauty of Indian tradition so as to be unaware of actual present defects ; nor does he forget that those who write against or in praise of India must do so with exactness, discrimination, and the latter with the avoidance of mere puffing general statements. He is definite and balanced and gives one the impression of being thoroughly reliable."—*Theosophist* (*A de L*).

"I admire the spirit of absolute fairness with which Sir John Woodroffe has approached the task —should be studied carefully by every Indian who aspires to lead the people and to mould the aspirations of his countrymen."—*Indian Review* (*Hon. Mr. Justice Seshagiri Aiyar*).

"The whole book is replete with useful suggestions to every one who is interested in a proper understanding of Indian culture—Sir John who has devoted many years to the study of Indian religion and who brings to his task a judicial frame of mind and abundant sympathy has no difficulty

in proving the utter hollowness of Mr. Archer's conclusions."—*Vedanta Keshari*.

"We have not seen any one who loves Bhârata as Sir John Woodroffe does. His pre-eminence consists in this that he has said that the service (Seva) of Bharata is the service of Shri Bhagavan." *Utsava (R.D.M.)*

"Sir John Woodroffe rightly earned the gratitude of the people by his recent vigorous repudiation of the many unjust aspersions made on India and the Indians by a foreign critic." (Hon. Justice Sir Abdur Rahim in his Convocation Address (1919) to the Mysore University.)

By the same Author

BHARATA SHAKTI

COLLECTION OF ADDRESSES ON INDIAN
CULTURE.

"The thoughtful sayings of an honest foreigner, a true Muni or "Freethinker" as he himself interprets the Hindu terms.....ought to be in the hands of every Indian. It would give him thought and self respect. The Christian Missionary and the Christian Orientalist are the two great factors of Indian denationalisation. We fight the third factor the politician more or less successfully. We have fought the Missionary and defeated him generally but the scars of his early attacks we are unconsciously bearing as acceptable badges.....Thus when we run down—we are unwittingly showing our-

selves as Chelas of the mediocrity of Europe. Like a living organism we must cast off the foreign matter trying to bore a home into our intellectual system. Sir John does not spare the Indian mind in its analysis. He has very ably shown that our so often professed Vairagya is more often our incapacity and sometimes philosophic confusion. The little book is one of those productions which would go to make a new age in this country. It is a protest against cultural suicide of a civilization designed by its past to live for ever."—*Modern Review*.

"Sir John Woodroffe rarely says anything which has not an element of originality in it. He makes a powerful plea against the cultural conquest of this country by the nations of the West...a vigorous plea which we commend to the notice of every true born Indian. Sir John's sympathy is bold and fearless as his scholarship is deep and erudite—he has a clear and perspective view of our culture."—*Amrita Bazar Patrika*.

"The whole of the booklet is studded with shining gems of thought and thrilling insight into truth...this sterling faith in the profound individuality of India, in the glorious future which She is bound to work out for Herself, in the great mission She is to fulfil in the world, animates every word spoken in the addresses compiled in this book. We cannot, in fact, overestimate the necessity of every student of India, of every worker in Her cause, furnishing himself with a copy of this compilation and it is

our ardent wish that the great exponent of the wonderful Tantrik lore of India would more often make time to come forward, as in these addresses, to contribute his weighty ideas to the keen intellectual struggle going on in our country round practical problems of re-organising our life and thought.”
—*Prabuddha Bharata*.

“Inspiring title—he has what is not given to many, understood the soul of India. He is a thorough sympathiser with Indian aspirations and has dwelt upon the real aim and purpose of our efforts. Ought to be read by every patriotic Indian. He will then have a clear vision and feel a new strength in his onward struggle.”—*New India*.

“Each of these papers is overflowing with thoughtfulness and desire to do good to Bharata. We ask every English educated man to read it. It will give us reverence for our natural culture and will save us from the thoughtless spirit of imitation.”

“Politically India is dead, this is bad enough but if cultural conquest follows the political then She will be truly dead. Is India to be a mere name and Her culture assigned to the cold room of the Oriental scholar, or is She to be a living form?” Sir John Woodroffe takes up the question with as much enthusiasm as the youngest Nationalist amongst us. His answer is one of courage and hope...but Sir John is not blind to the difficulties.”—*Searchlight*.

THE SEED OF RACE

An Essay on Indian Education.

Price Re. 1.

BY SIR JOHN WOODROFFE
OPINIONS.

"There is much in this little essay with which the student of India cannot but heartily agree."

—*Asiatic Review*.

"Of immense value...what is Sangskara, the Racial soul, the author as one who has dived deep into Indian Philosophy fully discusses in detail...this is the right view of Indian Education."—*Searchlight—Patna*.

All who seek knowledge as to the essentials of Indian education should possess and study carefully a copy of this book.

—*New India*.

"Readers of 'Is India Civilized' will realise how well qualified the author is to offer an opinion on the maintenance of racial culture. His answer is sufficient to refute the contention of his critics that his love for the old and beautiful in Indian Culture has made his outlook reactionary."—*Theosophist (A de L.)*,

PUBLISHED BY GANESH & Co., MADRAS.